



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

064798117

064798117



5076

~~ANNEX 113.~~

575

Library of



Princeton University.

Presented by

WM. M. SLOANE, LL.D.









THE  
JEWISH ALTAR:

An Inquiry

INTO THE  
SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE EXPIATORY  
OFFERINGS OF THE MOSAIC RITUAL.

*WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR TYPICAL  
CHARACTER.*

BY  
JOHN LEIGHTON, D.D.

"Do we, then, make void the law? Nay, we establish the law."

FUNK & WAGNALLS:

NEW YORK:  
10-12 DEY STREET.

1886.

LONDON:  
44 FLEET STREET.



Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1886, by  
FUNK & WAGNALLS,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

Y71283V18U  
Y7A98U  
L.N. 307304894

## Symbol vs. Type.

---

“Types and Symbols are by no means identical. Symbol stands related to thought, as being its expression to the senses ; Type to the antitype, as the shadow to the reality. The Symbol represents the invisible ; Type prefigures what is yet hidden.”

OOSTERZEE,

*Theology of the New Testament, Sec. 4, 7.*

(RECAP)  
5076  
575

OCT -51909 251219



## PREFACE.

---

THOUSANDS of thoughtful Bible readers can attest that no part of the work of expounders of Scripture is ordinarily so unsatisfactory as their handling of Old Testament typology. The impression is abroad that interpreters have somehow failed even to find the clew leading to the proper understanding of those parts of the Sacred Word. Especially is it felt that the ritual of the Altar had, for the ancient Church, a then present deeper inward reality, and an outward vigorous reach, far beyond what is commonly ascribed to it ; and consequently that it stood far more fundamentally related to the Christian dispensation than commentators point out. Under this impression the present writer has labored for fifty years.

What is here submitted to the reader is respectfully offered as a contribution toward the solution of this problem. The key which fits all the wards of the lock, and throws back the bolt with smoothness, is thereby shown to be the right one. It is for the reader to say how far—if at all—the present essay meets the like requirements, by opening the door where so many Bible students have stood embarrassed and perplexed.\*

---

\* Before this book was given to the press the author died. It is being published without alteration, and without that careful and critical revision of the proof sheets which an author alone can give. If errors in references or other matters appear, they are attributable to this want of supervision.



# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. Introductory .....	9
CHAPTER II. The Characteristic of the Mosaic Ritual.....	11
CHAPTER III. The Altar Service a Reality Having an End within Itself.....	17
CHAPTER IV. The Jewish Church a Necessary Factor in the Problem.....	23
CHAPTER V. Christ was not to be Read in the Altar Ritual.. ...	27
CHAPTER VI. The Bible Doctrine of Types.....	41
CHAPTER VII. Objections Answered... ..	53
1. "This Reduces the Types to Mere Illustrations"... ..	53
2. "Destroys the Unity of the Scriptures".....	54
3. "Excludes Christ from much of the Bible".....	56
4. "Makes much of Scripture Unspiritual".....	57
5. "The Gospel was Preached to Israel".....	60
6. "The Law was Fulfilled in Christ".....	61
7. "Israel must have Known of Christ".....	62
CHAPTER VIII. The Common View Fraught with Evils.....	68
1. Destroys the Antithesis between the Law and the Gospel.....	68
2. The Sacrifices, Taken as a Glass Reflecting Christ, misleading.....	69
3. Contravenes the Reason Given for the Abolition of the Ritual.....	71
4. Overturns the Law of Orderly Development of Doctrine in Scripture.....	73
5. Emblematizing, when Introduced, Runs Riot.....	77
6. Creates Doubt as to the Sense of Scripture.....	79
7. Brings the Bible into Disrepute.....	80
8. Is Intractable to any Laws of Interpretation.....	81
CHAPTER IX. The Divine Intent of the Law of Sacrifice.....	83
1. The Individual Worshipper was Instructed :	
(a) That he was a Guilty Sinner. ....	84
(b) And Deserving of Death.....	85
(c) That Expiation Must be Made.....	86

	PAGE
(d) That he was Personally Polluted.....	87
(e) Reached God's Favor through Mercy.....	88
(f) There was Need of a Better Sacrifice.....	89
2. It Gradually Revived in the Nation the Lost Ideas and Sense of Holiness.....	92
3. As a Heavy Yoke it Prepared Israel for Gospel Grace.....	98
(a) As Children they Needed a Multiplicity of Ordi- nances of Definite Shape.....	99
(b) This Multiplicity and Definiteness Hedged Israel from Idolatry.....	99
(c) Drilled in the Spirit of Obedience.....	100
(d) Tended to Make Gospel Liberty to be Appreci- ated.....	100
(e) Perpetual Repetition would Impress a People Slow to Learn.....	101
4. The Sin-offerings being Actual Atonements within the Theocracy, the Whole System Inculcated the Doctrine of Vicarious Suffering for Sin.....	102
CHAPTER X. Relation of the whole Economy to the Gospel and the Christian Church....	107
1. Permanent Value of the Record.....	107
2. Necessary Principles of Gospel Interpretation....	108
3. Judaism no Failure.....	124
CONCLUSION.....	127

# THE JEWISH ALTAR.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY.

WITHOUT any violence to sacred Scripture, the whole contents of the Bible might be arranged under three separate heads. The first would comprise all those portions of Holy Writ which exhibit and enforce the necessity for salvation, as this exists in man's sinful estate. Looking to this end, while subserving other purposes as well, is that large amount of sad narrative found in the Old Testament. The second would embrace those parts adapted to prepare men's minds and hearts for the gospel method of salvation. Here we should include all matter fitted to rebuke men's efforts of self-recovery, and also all that is designed to instruct and drill the heart in the great principles which underlie the gospel. The third division would contain the gospel itself—especially the great historical facts which centre in the person and work of Christ. These are found chiefly in the New Testament, and notably in the four Evangelists. Let it be emphasized that by the *gospel* is meant, in the following pages, not the doctrine of repentance, of mercy, or of substitution of the innocent for the guilty, but *Christ* and salvation through *Him*. The other things are all found even in pagan religions. But "Christianity



is Christ ;" and the gospel proclaims His person and His work in our behalf.

The drift of the following essay would locate the types and symbolism of Moses, and especially the whole ritual of the Altar, not—as is commonly done—in the last of these three divisions, but chiefly in the *second*, and in some small part also in the first. That ritual, in looking forward to the Redeemer, is not understood to be occupied in speaking directly of His sacrifice, but rather in making the greatly needed preparation for His coming and His work.

When it is remembered that the reception of the gospel must always be the free and glad act of the soul, and that this act can proceed only from a conviction of guilt and danger, and also from some apprehension of the principles on which mercy is dispensed, it becomes manifest that the first and second divisions of Scripture, as now defined, do not yield in importance to the third, though indeed they possess none of the glory or attractions of the gospel portion of the Word of God. The work of casting up the highway for the coming of the King may be less exultant than the trumpeting which heralds His advance ; but the patient toil which goes before is, in its place, no less indispensable than the proclamation which tells that the Prince is at hand.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE CHARACTERISTIC OF THE MOSAIC RITUAL.

AN *emblem* is the sign of a reality not then present, a representation of some other thing natural or moral. The representation may be a material object, as a ladder, to denote the means of elevation in politics ; or it may be an action, as the ancient shooting of an arrow across a national boundary line, to denote war. A *symbol*, on the other hand, though the word is often loosely used in the sense of an emblem, is not, strictly speaking, a sign of a reality beyond itself. It is "a sign included in the idea which it represents—*i.e.*, an actual part chosen to represent the whole ;" thus a formula of doctrine is termed a symbol.

A ritual form is not necessarily emblematic. It may be so in part or in whole ; or, not representing anything beyond itself, it may not be emblematic at all. It frequently contains the reality within itself. Marriage is commonly celebrated with ritual forms, but those forms are not representations of things not there present. In and of themselves they are solemn realities of vowing and affirming. On the other hand, the use of water in the rite of baptism is wholly emblematic, being a sign of spiritual cleansing.

Retaining the stricter definition of an emblem now given, it is here claimed that the services of the Jewish Altar are to be viewed as ritual forms having in them, as their chief characteristic, very little, if anything, em-

blematic. As will be shown in proper place, the order of sacrifice, like the signing and sealing of an important document, was a pregnant reality, though that reality was indeed a very small miniature when compared with the stupendous facts of the gospel. In accordance with this view of the ritual of Moses, we are to understand the declaration that it was "a shadow," and "a figure of the true" (Heb. 8 : 5 ; 9 : 24). These words have no reference to the idea of *emptiness*, but convey the important truth that the Mosaic system had the same outline with that of the gospel, and that the several parts of the former were proportionate to corresponding parts in the latter, each answering to each, as the outline of a shadow corresponds to the shape of the object that casts it. A model such as may be found in the Patent Office is thus the counterpart of a colossal engine to be seen elsewhere ; but yet it is a reality within itself, and it may be a working model.

When ritual forms are legitimately employed, we may dispose of them in one or the other of two classes :

1. They may be introduced having necessary explanatory words accompanying them, as seen in the words of Christ at the Last Supper, which rite is indeed highly emblematic. Such explanatory words may be called the key. But in this case the rite, so far forth, cannot be intended to instruct—*i.e.*, to convey fresh information to the mind, because the key, unfolding the meaning of the rite, is much more effectual for information than is the rite itself. A key supposes a lock. But why employ a lock, if the key must always be present with it ? If the object be to inform, why wrap up the information in a mysterious rite, if that information be given plainly alongside of it ?

But rites symbolic of realities already known, or rites

having explanations joined with them, may be wisely employed to refresh the memory, and especially to impress the heart. The feast of unleavened bread was a symbol of this kind. The accompanying history referred it to the great national deliverance from Egypt, and the annual celebration of the ritual feast revived in the Jewish heart a vivid remembrance of the divine interposition. So of the symbolic act in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Were the mournful event to which it relates unknown to the celebrants, or if no explanation were given interlinking the rite with the event, it would convey no lessons, neither could the participants make anything certainly out of it. But its use is not to inform. Its design is to impress and bridge over to the heart what is otherwise made known. Hence the accompanying words of explanation are necessary ; and with them the service is exceedingly wise.

But we shall find no such explanation accompanying the daily sacrifices, referring those forms to any historical event whatever, or, least of all, to anything in the prophetic future. Therefore they cannot belong to this class. The same denial may be made respecting a very large part of the Levitical service—the washings, oblations of flour and salt, the offerings of incense ; and no less respecting the so-called “typical” persons of the Old Testament, as these are commonly expounded. They are left without explanation by any words interlinking them with realities either past or future.

2. A rite or symbol may be so striking in its very form that no subjoined explanation is needed. It explains itself. The wooden yoke worn on the neck of Jeremiah, when he warned Israel of the captivity, told its own tale of bondage. For symbolic ends the image of an eye is often used, or that of a lamp ; and the idea

conveyed is palpable to all. So the figure of a human skeleton is frequently pictured as a sign. While the truth thereby signified may be somewhat more obscure, it is yet sufficiently plain to be discerned by all who have sober thought.

We shall discover that the Mosaic sacrifices, and many other parts of that service, belong rather to this latter class. Being unaccompanied with any key to unlock what lay beneath their surface, they must have been self-explanatory. Such was their shape that they spoke for themselves. The attentive observer could, and did, discern their meaning on their front. No mystery lay hidden within them.

Not because of this plainness of meaning, but because of other reasons far more conclusive, we should be very far from making those sacrifices emblematic. An emblem is "an allusive picture suggesting some other object, quality, or the like" (Webster). But the Altar service was a different thing. It was, we insist, a sober reality in and of itself. It is to be classed with such an act as bowing in deference to a superior; or that of kneeling, as expressive of veneration; or that of signing and sealing a covenant; or that of the ceremonial of marriage. All these are obvious expressions of present realities, and they have an inherent force of their own.

Connected with the Altar service there were indeed emblematic acts, such as the washings at the laver and the laying of the hands on the head of the victim. But the corresponding realities were of the subjective kind, were always obvious, and were—or should have been—then and there realized.

There is no possible comparison explanatory of the nature of the Jewish ritual more telling than that of the Apostle Paul. He calls those ceremonials *stoicheia*,

rudiments, like the elementary sounds of letters and syllables. These are not emblems. They enter into the composition of words, and fix their pronunciation. The child must learn to utter them before he can possibly go forward with his reading ; and through all his reading he must necessarily take them with him.

It may, however, be denied that Israel did understand the teachings of their ritual, and appeal may be made to the words of Paul (2 Cor. 3 : 13), where he shows how "Moses put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not look to the end of that which is abolished."

To this it may be replied, first, that even if they did not fail to apprehend the drift of their observances, this was their own fault. The Lord would never have given them a service which, while unexplained by accompanying words, they were constrained to go through, all their days, without understanding. And, in fact, whatever their blindness was, their own prophets hold them responsible for it ; the fault was in them, not in the obscurity of their service. But, secondly, that which was hidden from the Jewish people by "the vail upon their hearts" was, not the great primary lesson of their sacrificial system, but the fact and the superior glory of the new dispensation. They could not see that their system was ever to be "done away in Christ." After the coming in of the gospel they continued to go over their alphabetical forms ; and while catching the tone and tenor of these with considerable accuracy, they refused to turn to the page beyond the alphabet. Having received the elementary knowledge which their ritual imparted, they declined to respond to the gospel call, or to ask for the better and higher knowledge which was needed to supplement their primary lessons, and for

which those lessons prepared them. They utterly failed to perceive there *was* a spiritual gospel to be introduced and read, while their alphabetical round was to be left behind, though not to be forgotten. A child may have a fair understanding of his primer, and yet fail to perceive the relations of that book to what is to follow. He may not be aware anything is to follow.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE ALTAR SERVICE A REALITY HAVING AN END WITHIN ITSELF.

As all concede, the ritual acts of the Mosaic institute, and especially the offerings of bloody sacrifices, were by no means *opera operata*, beginning and ending with an outward performance. They had a deep inner significance every way worthy of their Author. They were typical representations and expressions of essential truth (Heb. 8 : 5 and 9 : 9).

But while they are properly called *symbols*, inasmuch as they presented religious truth by means of object lessons before the eye, it must yet be distinctly understood that the most important of them all—*i.e.*, the bloody offerings, were none the less substantial realities, accomplishing by their own force certain great religious ends, for the time being.

The common interpretation makes it the special office of those sacrifices to "point the minds of the worshippers to Christ." We are usually told they had such an anticipative force and manifest meaning that they presented the Redeemer to the faith of him who did the service. The ritual of the Altar is represented as doing a work like that of the mirror in a reflecting telescope. The glass brings before the eye an object which cannot, for the time, be at all seen by any stretch of direct vision. That object, say expounders, is Christ on the cross. Commentators not only for themselves see in those rites



the great sacrifice for sin, but they strangely insist that the ancient Jew saw, or could see, the same thing. As a sample of this kind of interpretation, consult Bonar's Commentary on Leviticus. In that fanciful production nearly every verse of this book of Moses is made available for this gospel end. Every fact and feature of New Testament doctrine is there discerned. And, indeed, so well-nigh universal is this understanding of the Mosaic ritual, that it may seem bold to question it. And so closely is it interwoven with a certain kind of pious meditation, that the present attempt to show its nullity may jar hard on the religious feelings of some. But truth can do no ultimate harm.

The difference between the common view and the interpretation now to be given may be summarily stated thus : In this essay the Old Testament symbols are taken as definitions settling the principles behind New Testament facts ; the other employs New Testament facts to explain the ritual usages of the old economy, as Israel is supposed to have understood them. That method forces the realities of the new economy into the figures of " the oldness of the letter ;" the present employs those figures to fix and settle the realities of " the newness of the Spirit." That other takes the antitype back to expound the type ; this brings the type forward to expound the antitype. In short, the common method finds all the high lessons of gospel wisdom in the alphabet of the Hebrew primer ; this treatise uses the letters of the Hebrew primer as " rudiments" to compose the words and fill out the wonderful record of " the hidden wisdom" of the gospel.

But let here be distinctly stated, once for all, that the sacrifices and all the ritual of the Jewish worship did have an anticipative intent and drift, as shaped by the

mind and as viewed by the eye of their divine Author. While the sacrificial forms were realities within themselves, God ordained them all in view of the far more glorious realities of the gospel in its day ; and had it not been His gracious purpose that the gospel should follow in "the fulness of time," there is no reason to believe that the Jewish ritual would have gone before. Although the letters of the alphabet do not contain, or even suggest, what wisdom may come to be written by means of it, yet the alphabet would never have been devised by men had they not needed it wherewith to record their thoughts. Although the condition of the "pre-Adamite earth" gave no clear hint of the coming of the human race, much less any suggestion of what that race would be in dignity and destiny, yet is it most true that in the great elemental changes which had been going on for ages there was a divine purpose constantly looking forward to man, and a shaping of things for his abode. The tempering of the atmosphere, the formation of the soil, the depositing and location of the coal—all were foreseen and intended as preparative of man's dwelling-place. Naturalists have been astonished and awed by observing the prevalence and persistence of certain *types* of being, as that of the vertebrate in animals, running back through countless ages before the rise of man. In the amazing persistence of this one type, as also in its origin, the all-wise Creator no doubt looked forward to *man*, in whom it finds its consummation and crown. And in some inscrutable way the human frame may so depend upon that pre-existing type that, but for the purpose of God to create man the antitype, the all-seeing Creator might never have introduced that pattern of being which prevailed previously through millions of years. "Doth God take care for oxen?" Thus the

origin and form of the whole Jewish economy. In giving shape to its every part, the eye of its divine Author was ever on the Life-giving Dispensation which was to follow, and the foreseen glories of this determined throughout what should be the form of that.

But the anticipative view of the Creator in His preparatory work is one thing, and altogether another is the possibility of any creature to comprehend beforehand the outcome of that work ; and equally another that God, when making preparation, should intend or expect the creature to discern its glorious going forth in the end in which it is to find its consummation.

That the common method of interpreting the Mosaic sacrifices—the method which reads gospel realities in them, and which we may call allegorizing—is an error, may be made to appear by a fair exhibition of Bible facts ; and a legitimate exposition of Bible figures will show that those rites spoke not of Christ, unless, indeed, we allow that rhetorical sense in which the pre-Adamite mammals “spoke” of the coming of man on earth. They were occupied with a work very different from preaching the gospel, and the lessons intended by them, and actually learned, were far more in place, because far more seasonable at the time, both for the Jewish people and the then future of the Christian Church. Without being in the least in the shape of a pointing finger directing the eye to gospel facts, they were of a use far better—namely, to drill and prepare Israel for gospel times and gospel things, and to fix the necessary principles according to which gospel truths must be everywhere accepted.

The *Princeton Review* (January, 1848), recognizing an important distinction already made, gives as the whole truth in one word : “ All these (rites) were sym-

bols, as distinguished from prophetic types, and as such suited to prepare the way for the Christian system, without confounding the two dispensations by an anticipation of the gospel light amid the shadows of the law" (p. 100). The purpose of those rites, as here stated, makes them a matter of deep and enduring interest to us and to all men who would rightly receive the gospel. "The law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." The ancient pedagogue was indeed ignorant of all the advanced lessons taught in the school. He was a mere slave, who brought the pupils to the door and, without looking in, left them there. At most he taught only the primer words and letters which formed the necessary basis of the whole tuition of the school. In the religion of the Mosaic Altar God looked forward, "foreseeing some better thing for us," while He did not therein reveal that to the Jewish worshipper.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE JEWISH CHURCH A NECESSARY FACTOR IN THE PROBLEM.

“To Israel pertaineth the service,” or altar worship (Rom. 9 : 4). That service being therefore primarily designed for the instruction of the Jewish Church, and having there fulfilled its mission, that people can never be left out of the account, if we would learn the great end secured by that ancient ritual. Whatever be the significance of those symbols, or however far their reach beyond the Jewish people and period, this people is a most essential link in the chain interlinking all the truth which that ritual conveys to us. Whatever was the impression it was ordained to make, Moses’ people were a necessary party to be religiously impressed. This exalts the great fact that the Mosaic dispensation and its practical working were introductory to the gospel.

It follows from this that the practical instruction which that ritual conveys to the Christian Church it conveys not altogether aside from, or independently of, the ancient worshippers in those rites, but in great part through those worshippers, and by means of them. It was ordained, says an apostle, “that they without us should not be made perfect.” The root is not perfect without the branches ; the flowering out and beauty are above. But this is spoken of the Jewish people, not of Jewish things. Those things—their rites—were for them, and they personally were for us ; and thus their rites were for us through them and indirectly.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the Jewish Church and people were introductory to the Christian age, bridging over the wide chasm between the degradation and savagery of the ancient world and the high spiritual culture of the Church of Christ, and inasmuch as the bridging over was accomplished in good part by the salutary effect of Moses' ritual on his pupil, this salutary effect is by no means to be overlooked ; it is to be reckoned as chief among the great ends sought by God, who gave that service. All this is proof that the service was primarily for the Jews' religious advantage, and not for us over their heads. The culture of the olive tree is through the root—for the sake of the fruitful branches (Rom. 11 : 17, 18).

The common view of the ritual reverses all this. Going on the supposition that the people of Israel may be dropped from the chain as a link no longer of use, this view proceeds on the notion that, as far as those rites are concerned, we stand on common ground with Israel of old ; that the ritual continues to preach the same gospel direct to us ; and that we therefore, leaving Israel out of the account, may independently allegorize that ancient service for our own edification. Long before the break of day a friend is despatched to your door with an important message for you. Because of the darkness in which that friend has to walk, there is placed in his hand a candle for his guidance on the way. When he reaches you the sun is up. You would make a strange mistake if, neglecting his message, you supposed his business was simply to come and put that candle in your possession. You would strangely use it if you went forth with it, holding it aloft to give you light, while the high sun is shining all around you. Yet just like this is the mistake of those who, walking in the

clear light of the Christian age, resort to those ancient symbols as though they were prophecies, like the words of Malachi, to be read by us independently of the attitude of the Jewish people. They forget that that ritual was the candle to benefit Israel in times of darkness, and they force on it a modern interpretation drawn from modern and Christian things. With that candle we have indeed much to do, but it is as held in the hand of Israel, and as it guided him to the door of the Christian Church, our home. Why trim for ourselves this dim lamp as a prophecy, now when the Sun of Righteousness fills the world with light? Why should the Lord, two thousand years before the time, prepare for us this feeble taper—feeble if viewed as a preaching of Christ—to be held up by us amid the glare of gospel day? Did he not intend in due time to send His Son, a great Teacher, and to commission apostles to do their inspired work? Why should He ask us dimly and doubtfully to trace out Christ crucified in those ancient “types and shadows,” when we have all around us the clear realities of gospel truth? Why hold up a candle to the sun? We have indeed a deep interest in that ancient service; but it is not the work of drawing sunlight from a candle amid real sunshine.

Dr. John Hall (*Homiletic Review*, vol. 9, p. 226) likens the ritual system to a despatch written according to “a telegraphic code,” *in cipher*, we suppose, and committed to the operator—the Jewish worshipper—to be transmitted by him over the line to the party “at the other end”—the Christian Church—which is enabled to read the cipher, while its import is kept hidden from the operator. “He does not understand it,” says Dr. Hall. This illustration implies that the Jewish people could make nothing out of a service which occupied them for

a thousand years ! Worse than this, it supposes the All-wise transmitted through the ages, and to the Christian Church, a message so obscure that it could be understood only by sending again the same message in the plainest writing, to be the interpretation of the "telegraphic code;" for according to the theory assumed, by the gospel alone, direct from heaven in its day, can the secret telegram be explained. But why either the telegram, or an explanation of it, when we have got the substance of it otherwise, and in full, and in plain language ? Who is benefited by it ? Not the Jew, for he never understood it. Not the Christian, for he has the plain gospel direct from above. Dr. Hall adds : "It is understood at the other end ; that is enough." So far from being enough to vindicate the wisdom of the procedure, the comparison exposes the straits to which the allegorizers are driven.

But Israel was no mere operator sending forward cipher despatches. Not only was the Altar service primarily intended for that people, but it was admirably adapted to their condition, and among them it actually fulfilled its mission from heaven. The word of the Lord, no less in the law than in the gospel, accomplishes the end whereunto he sent it. And just because the ceremonial law did fulfil its mission, the more should we turn from the candle Israel bore, and hear rather the pregnant message which the Jewish Church brings to our ears. For Israel, as distinct from his ritual worship, is very far from being a useless figure that may be safely eliminated from the great problem of gospel truth.

In confirmation of this point we may here anticipate one particular in a topic which will be handled farther on. If we, forgetting Israel, read the ritual law as though it was addressed directly to *us*, and if we take up



as the truth the impression which such reading would make upon *our* minds, we certainly shall misread both the spirit and intent of that ritual. We must therefore constantly keep in mind the fact that that institute was primarily intended for Israel, and was exactly adapted to meet the condition of that people ; and we must never forget to ask, What impression was it adapted to make on *them* ? That impression is the clew to the true intent of the whole system. No less must we ask, What was the work at length effected for Israel by their drill before the Altar for more than a thousand years ? That work we must recognize and retain ; for therein are comprised the foundation principles underlying all the great facts of the gospel, and upon the realization of those principles by Israel all gospel truth did at first proceed, and must continue to proceed as long as the gospel is preached. For both these reasons the people of Israel and the outcome of their law among them are of the utmost importance to our problem.

## CHAPTER V.

### CHRIST WAS NOT TO BE READ IN THE ALTAR RITUAL.

It is saying very little to assert—what has been already intimated—that not even the more pious of the Jewish Church saw anything of Christ personally in their appointed sacrifices. Although Christ is largely in Jewish prophecy, and was there seen by the Jewish people, nowhere in their history, in their confessions, in their psalms of praise, do we read a solitary expression indicating that the service of the Altar led their thoughts on to a suffering Redeemer. But if that service had so much as suggested to their minds the great event of the cross, they would undoubtedly have often expressed the thought, and we should be able to find a frequent record of it. Nay, if Israel saw Christ at all in their service, they must, because of its many details, have seen nearly everything about Him ; and we should find them again and again saying so. But their silence is conclusive of the fact that they saw him not.

Do we clothe our confessions, prayers, and hymns of praise in gospel language ? We cannot avoid it. But the more pious of the Jewish Church, in their words of praise and prayer, in their suit for mercy, rather depreciated sacrifice. “Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I bring it.” But if “the Altar preached Christ,” was it seemly to slight it ?

We may take yet higher ground. The Jewish people, after a most diligent use of their facilities for learning,

could not in reason be expected to read in their offerings the sacrifice which was to be made for the sins of the world. To insist on the contrary is altogether gratuitous. The offering of a bullock's blood was certainly not an act so expressive of the future—of any future—as to be self-explaining of a distant and coming event as peculiar as was the death of our Redeemer. In its visible outline it could not, even dimly, foreshow Christ's all-atoning blood. The Jewish victim was slain with the knife and then laid upon the Altar, and there consumed with fire. But Jesus was lifted up on a cross, and nailed thereto alive, and left thus to die. The flesh of the sin-offering was consumed in the flames. But the body of our Lord was tenderly taken down and secured entire in a tomb. In short, aside from the act of inflicting death, there was no external resemblance whatever. Had the Redeemer died after the manner in which Isaac was threatened with death on Moriah, there might be some show of reason in saying Israel could read their Messiah's sacrifice in their ritual offerings.

Very pertinent, and also most corrective of the allegorizing which "dimly" finds Christ in that service, is the following from Dr. Fairbairn : "It would manifestly have been absurd to admit into a course of preparation for the realities of the gospel certain temporary exhibitions of the same great elements of truth that were to pervade these, unless the preparatory had been of more obvious meaning and of more easy comprehension than the ultimate and final. For thus only could it be wise or proper to set up preparatory dispensations at all" ("Typology," vol. 1, p. 51). That is to say, the elements of notation on the first pages of the arithmetic must go before the calculations of astronomy ; and they must go before, as being level to the weak comprehen-

sion of the tyro. So, then, if the realities of the gospel were to be read in the service of the Altar, they must—as was proper—have been read therein even more plainly than the New Testament. Yet Dr. Fairbairn, after writing the foregoing appropriate statement of scriptural wisdom, makes it the burden of his voluminous work to read Christ into the Mosaic ritual !

Dr. J. Munro Gibson ("The Mosaic Era," ch. 10) considers the rites of the Altar as prophecies of the gospel. "A bud is a thing of beauty in the spring, but is more—it is a prophecy of the flower which will bloom out in the summer." It may be styled a prophecy in the sense in which poets sing, but nothing better. Hence Dr. Gibson concedes : "It is very plain if you have never seen a flower, the bud would not have had for you any proper significance. Without the New Testament this typical significance (of the rites) could hardly be apprehended. . . . It does seem irrational to suppose that a complicated system of symbols should be given to Israel to be a dumb show for centuries, and then to be understood for the first time after the people to whom they had been given were scattered and peeled. The true order is to ascertain first what the tabernacle and its services meant to Israel." This reasoning is conclusive of the whole truth.

Inasmuch, then, as it is confessed that if the gospel realities were at all in that service, they were in it "dimly and in a shadowy manner," consistency requires us to conclude they were not there at all. Although the Jewish offerings were, as we shall see, so very plain as to be self-explaining, they did not, and could not, explain themselves as foreshowing the great event of Calvary. They belong to the second class of symbols, as already defined ; but to make them self-explaining of

the cross were as absurd as to make the simple alphabet declarative of all the truths contained in a masterly oration written in the letters of that alphabet.

But it may be said that wherein those services failed to proclaim Christ by their outward shape, they were accompanied by a key which made this proclamation clear. This should be denied. Search may be made through all the books containing the law of this ritual, and while it is seen to comprise a record of the most minute details, there will not be found one word, either plain or obscure, saying: "This means a suffering Redeemer." There is not even a well-defined hint looking in this direction. Contrast with this silence the explicit and repeated reference of the paschal lamb to the event of the Exodus; and this, too, although that event was in the past of Israel's own experience, and was recorded before their eyes in their own history, and although the passover was celebrated at the very period of the year when the Exodus took place. Contrast with it the explicit definition of the Lord's Supper; and this, while the sufferings it was intended to commemorate are detailed and proclaimed to the world; and, moreover, while the worshippers in the Christian rite so clearly explained occupy a higher plane than the Jewish Church, and through the New Testament look out over a wider horizon and in a clearer sky. "It is worthy of observation that the Mosaic ritual contains so few liturgical *formulas*—a strong proof that the ceremonies of the law were intended to speak for themselves, and be their own interpreter—an effect which could not be secured without an obvious resemblance and a natural association between type and antitype. But this analogy does not exist between the work and person of Christ and all the substances required in sacrifice" (*Princeton Review*,

January, 1848, p. 95). "The objection to this (prophetic) mode of interpretation rests upon its arbitrary character and the diversity of its results, together with the want of any obvious resemblance tending to suggest the truths conveyed at once to the observer by natural association" (*Ib.*, p. 94).

On this point there is an endless amount of assumption on the part of expounders. It is begun with the piety of Abel. "By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice." But it requires a large addition to the text to make out that Abel's sacrifice presented the Christ of the gospels to his faith, and that his faith rested specifically on the great atonement.

Will it yet be insisted that a sufficient explanation does accompany those sacrifices, and that this may be seen in their general scope, their unsatisfactory effect on the conscience, in the whole contexture of the law and the prophets, in their location within a preparatory economy? Wide-sweeping generalities like these are the frequent resort of disputants who have nothing definite to produce in their own defence. But all that these generalities contain, so far from affording evidence that the Jew had light on his sacrifices revealing to him the cross, is really in sharp contrast with any such evidence, considering the remoteness of the ancient Jew from the then future event of Calvary; considering that Christ and His atonement, when at length actually proclaimed, was a "great mystery," in that the amazing truth could not have been conceived till revealed from heaven; and considering that when the accomplished fact of the atoning death of Christ was preached, it was a stumbling-block to the Jews; nothing short of the plainest words accompanying the Mosaic ritual, and referring those offerings to this event, could have been an adequate key

to make them predictive of the Lamb of God. Let this one question be decisive : Where in all the prophets is there a clear explanation to this effect ? The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is commonly cited as the most decisive testimony. Doubtless we read there the doctrine of atonement in some general sense of that vague word ; but the prophecy falls far short of setting forth the suffering Messiah as “ offering Himself a sacrifice to God to satisfy divine justice.” Still further short is the language of the prophet from being such as even to suggest to the Jewish mind that the Altar service foreshadowed the Messiah’s sufferings. He was to be “ a Man of sorrows,” not only suffering in behalf of His people, but suffering in a strictly vicarious sense. But there is no interlinking of this with the Levitical oblations. “ It can be said from the Old Testament that in that dispensation it was clearly revealed that the Messiah was to die and to become *a sacrifice for sin*.\*

But as the service was intended for the instruction of God’s ancient people, and as He would not have had them go through a ceremonial round unmeaning to them, the true meaning must be sought where every worshipper could in reason be expected to find it—not in prophecies written, it may be, hundreds of years after he was dead—it must be sought in something *very near his hand, and far more obvious to him than the far-distant and mysterious event of the cross*.

Tending greatly to strengthen our denial is the additional reflection that if those Jewish offerings, as a whole, preached a more worthy sacrifice yet to be made, then each minute part of the service predicted a corresponding portion of gospel redemption. The flour, the salt, the

---

\* Bishop Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. VII.

beaten oil, the application of the blood to the thumb, the great toe, the tip of the ear—in short, the entire details of that complex and manifold ritual must have been like a grand historical picture having a thousand features, every one of them being true to the event portrayed. This remark is the more pertinent, inasmuch as great particularity touching those minute details was enjoined. “See thou make all things after the pattern shown thee in the mount.” The pins and curtains of the tent, the materials of the covering, their disposal, the direction in which the tabernacle was to face, the shape of the court, the garments of the priests, the color of the heifer of purification—all was settled by express command. That was counted a serious mistake of Eleazar when he burnt the goat of the sin-offering, instead of eating it in the holy place (Lev. 10 : 16).

Now, here was business to fill the hands of the pious Jew, as it at present racks the ingenuity of the allegorizing commentator, to find gospel in all this. If the Israelite could not be expected to find Christ in his liturgy, taken as a whole, how could he be rationally expected to find a “pointing to Christ” in each and every one of these parts in detail? We shall see what wild work modern expounders, even with the gospel written out before their eyes, have made of these details, while resolved to find a Redeemer in them. That work may prompt us to excuse the poor Jew—if blamable he was—when, in the darkness around him, he failed to see what some assume to be the predicted antitype in each and every particular of the ritual. Nay, from the very nature of the case it were absurd in us to suppose him so to have seen. And if absurd, then as certainly as the Israelite was required to render a rational service, the main thing now pretended to be in those ritualistic par-



ticalars is not prophetically in them, either singly or collectively.

Again, it is a common dictate of wisdom, in giving instruction, to suit the lessons to the years, the mental capacity, and the circumstances of the pupil. No wise teacher would address a little child as he would discourse to an intelligent man. The manner pursued with a well-trained Christian congregation in our land would never answer with a company of heathens surrounded with all the influences of their native paganism. But when God proceeds to teach men, He surely is as wise as the best human teachers. In giving His lessons to the Jewish people He had regard for their infantile minds, their ignorance and degradation, as emancipated slaves ; and He also had an eye on the adverse circumstances around them, in the dark and cruel superstitions that prevailed. Here all must consent.

When we come to look at the true intent of the Mosaic ritual, we shall find all this beautifully met. But the interpretation which makes those rites preach the gospel to Israel reverses all this method of heavenly wisdom. If the gospel was to be preached to Israel of old, it would have been in "great plainness of speech." In this plainness it behooves our missionaries to deliver it to pagans now. But the most of modern peoples can penetrate obscurity of manner far better than the men of the camp of Israel. The world has long been growing up to manhood. Light is more and more disseminated. The infancy of the human mind has passed away since Moses' time. How marked the difference between that Israel to whom the great lawgiver delivered the "shadowy" Levitical code, and the subsequent Israel to whom apostles preached with "unveiled face" ! The former were feeble-minded children ; the latter were

grown men, of vigorous thought, clear in their ideas, and ready to catch the drift of an argument. The methods of heavenly wisdom must have been adapted to the feeble condition of those children.

But the view now controverted supposes God gave a highly emblematic gospel, which is confessedly obscure, to men whose ignorance demanded the plainest words; and at the same time reserved the plain words of apostolic preaching for those who far less needed plainness—men who were able to apprehend mysteries. Listen to the expounders who force a gospel sense on the symbolism of Moses. Even they tell us the law presented Christ “*dimly* as in a glass;” that those Jewish rites “*faintly* foreshadowed the salvation of the cross.”

But, in fact, it is altogether erroneous to say that any truths intended for Israel were dimly revealed by the Altar, as though that people were required to see them through a mist. The Altar *implied* great truths which were not intended for Israel to know, just as the gospel implies great truths which it is not intended the Christian shall ever know on earth (1 Cor. 13 : 12). The difference between the Old Testament and the New is not in the clearness of what is expressly taught, but in the extent of what is revealed. The teaching of the Old Testament, as far as it went, was, as it needed to be, exceedingly plain, upon the truths intended to be made known. But the lessons of the law were confined to elementary things. It is plain even where in substance it says: “There is more beyond, unrevealed.” When Moses put a veil on his face, it was as much as to say: “What I have made known to you is plain enough; but there is far more which I have not made known.” (See Deut. 29 : 29 and 30 : 11–14.) And the New Testament writers of necessity say virtually the

same thing of themselves (John 20 : 30, 31 and 1 John 3 : 2). There is far more obscurity in the New Testament than is to be found in all the ritual of Moses, just as there is far more depth in a recondite discourse than in the letters of the alphabet. The direct outlook of the New Testament is into eternity, while the direct outlook of Moses' law is simply into the Christian Church and period. But eternity is incomparably more unfathomable than anything that pertains to the Christian age.

Dr. Bonar, in the preface to his commentary on Leviticus, expresses "fears that he may not always have succeeded in discovering the precise view of truth intended in these symbolic rites." Yet he is a learned divine of the nineteenth century, with the New Testament in his hand, and all the extensive apparatus of modern biblical study at his disposal. But in contrast with all this light and learning, consider the sort of people to whom "the gospel in Leviticus" was divinely sent. Were they a generation supernaturally endowed, who could extract recondite truth from obscure figures, even where modern divines utterly fail? The very reverse, our allegorizers themselves being judges. The confession of these as to the obscurity of the gospel in Jewish offerings of blood is a refutation of their doctrine.

Let us suppose that our missionaries to the heathen left behind the New Testament and all they had learned from it, and that, in laboring to convert their benighted hearers, they confine themselves to the words of Moses' ritual, and drill them in that alone, just as the Israelite was drilled. When would they rejoice in the first genuine convert to Christ? What would be thought of their method of evangelizing the pagan world? Would they not be considered absurd, not because the mission-

aries knew a better way, but because their symbolic method was in itself essentially foolish for the end sought? Would not those expositors themselves, who so readily see Christ on every page of Moses, be among the very first to rebuke this method of gospel preaching? Yet these men would have us believe that Moses was divinely charged to take this very method to bring Christ before the besotted people he led from Egypt; and these expounders ask us to assent that this method of preaching the gospel to them was the wisest that could be chosen!

If more needs to be said, consider that even to us—no children, but men of mature mind, “having our senses exercised by reason of use,” and inheriting vigorous powers of religious thought from a Christian ancestry—even to us the unveiled features of the New Testament are not too plain. Its clear truths, though repeated, fully exemplified, and forcibly illustrated, are yet by us often misapprehended, so that we end in dissensions among ourselves.

And how do these commentators find so much gospel under the forms of the ceremonial law? They find it alone by first becoming familiar with Christian things from the Christian source. Filling their minds with evangelical doctrine by the study of the New Testament, they carry this doctrine of Christ with them into their reading of the ritual law; and—full-grown Christians as they are—by this means alone do they have Christ even remotely suggested to them by their reading of Moses. Their Mosaic erudition reminds us of the procedure of little children before they have learned even their letters. Those children catch up snatches of prose and verse by hearing the reading of their seniors; then opening their primer, and looking on with grave face, they recite what

they have heard as though they found and read it all there ! But the Israelite of Moses' day did not enjoy the company of Christian friends. He did not carry with him a pocket copy of the gospels. If, therefore, he did not read Christ and finished redemption in his offerings of calves and goats, he is to be excused ; for, indeed, it was not there.

Even if we should concede that the Israelite not only could, but did, see the whole gospel in his ceremonial, we must insist the discovery could have done him very little good. If the gospel, plain and direct, could have benefited Israel materially, there is reason to believe God would not have withheld that light. He Himself demands : " What could have been done more to My vineyard that I have not done in it ? " But Moses' people were not prepared to profit by the gospel. Before they could advantageously behold the " great light " ordained to rise upon the world, their moral vision needed to be developed and invigorated. - Nay, it needed to be created anew. In that early dawn of time men's spiritual eyesight had become like that of moles and bats—exceedingly limited in its range. They would have been dazzled and blinded by the risen sun. Before those men could bear His radiance they needed to be trained in viewing less effulgent things—the dim outline of the starry horizon, " the tall dark mountains," of which Sinai was chief, and at most the glimmer of the constellations before the break of day.

We all recognize that it would have been very unreasonable if the twelve apostles had been sent forth " with unveiled face " to deliver their joyful message in the day, and to the people, of Moses. That would have been a sowing of precious seed on the frozen ground at midwinter. The world was not then ready for their

mission. There were preliminary lessons for mankind first to learn. A child that has not yet mastered the elements of spelling may be transferred to difficult reading, and, parrot-like, may be made to pronounce the sentences there. But no wiser would have been the preaching of the word in the camp of Israel, though delivered with all the plainness of a Paul.

We may be reminded that the spiritual truths of the gospel are now delivered to degraded pagans, and with good success. But even conceding that the whole world at the period of the Exodus was, in every aspect of the case, in no worse a condition than these degraded heathen of our day, the relation which the latter hold to gospel truth on earth is very different indeed. If there are still "dark places of the earth, full of the habitations of cruelty," over against this also exists the Christian Church. The conversion of modern pagans has always proceeded on the footing of her existence and through her influence, and not through the isolated agency of a few missionaries alone. The Church has ever been the necessary "base of operations." Her prayers and her spirit have been the advancing tide, of which the missionaries have been but the drops of spray thrown forward by her moral force. There is more truth in the parable of the leaven than has yet been drawn out of it. The energizing life of the kingdom must be located amid the dead mass of humanity before there can be any general quickening of the nations sunk in sin. But when Moses legislated, and for a long time thereafter, the leaven of the kingdom did not exist. This working force needed itself to be generated. Hence it was that the wisdom of God selected one nation, and by a necessary preparatory culture made it the suitable seed-plot for the whole world.

What the preparatory culture was which Israel must needs first receive we shall see farther on. But if a gospel proclaimed in plainness and spirituality would have been a gospel in vain to the tribes of ancient Israel, how much more in vain that same gospel exhibited before them in symbols, about the meaning of which even ministers of the New Testament are not agreed ! We are entitled to conclude that those symbols were not intended to set forth gospel facts at all. Without even intimating what was to come, they simply threw up the great highway for Christ and His salvation.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF TYPES.

THE advocates of the common view of the Mosaic sacrifices rest their case mainly on a certain understanding of a truth that is both great and unquestionable—that is, the *typical character* of the Jewish Altar. The several parts of that ancient ritual are expressly called “types and shadows” (Heb. 8 : 5) ; they are set forth as “a figure for the time then present” (Heb. 9 : 9), and a “shadow of good things to come” (Heb. 10 : 1).

It is right and it is of prime importance here to go behind the manner in which these passages of Scripture are commonly cited, and to inquire what in Bible usage is meant by the words *type*, *shadow*, and *figure*.

It is not denied that these terms, and various other Scripture phrases, with great uniformity convey to the mind of the ordinary reader the idea of prediction. But this impression is brought about not in the least by the legitimate force of the words, but simply by the persistent paraphrasing of expounders. As we well know, by dint of repetition there may be associated with any word, as its popular meaning, a new idea which before was wholly foreign to its use. In fact, it is always in this very way that the transitionary and secondary sense is given to all words. Men will have it so and use it so ; and their use makes it so. Thus it has fared with these Scripture words on the lips of expounders. So, then, to get at the inspired sense of these terms, we must



go behind those new ideas subsequently affixed to them.

The most decisive of these is the word *type*.\* But even in its present most common use—in the art of printing—this term does not suggest a counterpart in some document yet to be printed. Men may look at printers' type without supposing there is anywhere on earth a page to correspond with it. However, far less does the Greek word in the New Testament suggest a counterpart to which it refers. That word is derived from a verb which signifies *to strike*, and it means *impression, stamp*, etc. From this primitive sense the term naturally passes over to mean *class, like, kind, having characteristics in common*, because repeated strokes of the same instrument always make a like impression. Thus we speak of types of disease and types in natural history. But here all idea of prediction is not only wanting, but is necessarily excluded. The Greek term falls in very nearly with the word *character*, also Greek, which signifies *a mark*, as upon a coin; and so it comes to denote *the mark common to a sort, the characteristic*. But neither here is there anything predictive.

Exceedingly apt is the use of the word *type* by a noted author when defending the supernatural: "All the steps of the great argument of Butler are founded on the belief that all the truths and difficulties of religion have their type in the constitution and course of nature."† Not that the difficulties seen in nature in the least fore-

---

\* The word *type* is not found in the text of our authorized version. Was the exclusion unintended by the translators? Or had they some good reason for it?

† The Reign of Law.

show like difficulties in Revelation. But they are *analogous* to them. Such precisely is the New Testament use of the term. "He wrote a letter after this manner"—type (Acts 23 : 25). What predicted antitype had this? "Adam was the figure [type] of Him that was to come"—that is, Adam had something in common with Christ, in that he stood at the head of the race, as our Lord stands the Head and Representative of the Church. To go beyond this and say that Adam was formed in order to foreshow Christ is preposterous. Paul (1 Cor. 10 : 11) cites the apostasies and punishments of ancient Israel, and adds : "All these things happened unto them for types." But the most fanciful allegorizer of the Old Testament will hardly say that the camp of Israel fell into idolatry and was punished in order to foreshow the dangers and corrections of erring Christians. He will not venture even to say those "types" of dancing, revelry, and death had in them anything whatever of a prophetic nature. Paul means simply to declare—and employs the word in its ordinary sense in declaring—that the lapse of Israel into the pollution of idolatry was of the stamp or character with the sins of the Corinthians, and that these might therefore expect to suffer as Israel did. In 1 Pet. 3 : 21 we read : "The antitype to which" (Noah's deliverance), "*even* baptism doth now save us." Dr. Fairbairn quotes approvingly from Bishop Marsh, as an essential principle, that "the type must not only resemble the antitype, but must have been *designed* to resemble it." "It is," says he, "this previous design and *preordained* connection which constitutes the relation of type and antitype." This rule cuts off one half nearly of the examples of types expressly so called in the New Testament. Who can believe that the flood ever "pointed" men to baptism,

much more that the flood was pre-ordained to point to it? It is probably with an eye to such difficulties that Dr. Fairbairn in a note\* discriminates between what he calls "the scriptural as opposed to the theological sense" of the word *type*, conceding that in numerous passages of Scripture "*it very nearly corresponds to our words, model, pattern, exemplar.*" Such a discrimination reveals the extreme exigencies of the common interpretation; and the concession here made is a virtual abandonment of the common understanding of types as predictions of gospel realities. Opposition between theology and Scripture is rather a suspicious thing. "The scriptural as opposed to the theological sense" is just what we seek to establish.

Here we may bring in question another of Dr. Fairbairn's leading principles. "There must," says he, "be a resemblance in form or spirit between the type and that which answers to it in the gospel." Between the ritual type and the antitype there is generally no real resemblance whatever, neither, indeed, can there be. What resemblance, for example, could there be between the "heavenly things" (Heb. 8 : 5) and the type of those spiritualities in the form of the tabernacle? But while there was no direct resemblance whatever, there was a correspondence of *relations*. The relation of part with part of the several parts of the tabernacle stood over against the relation of the several related realities of the heavenly sanctuary. All this accords well with Webster's definition of *type* as "the aggregate of characteristics." And no less does it exhibit the true Bible idea of an *antitype*, as the aggregate of characteristics in one thing, *standing over against* the aggregate of

---

\* Typology, vol. 1, p. 46.

those in another, when there exists this correspondence of relations.

We are now prepared to see what were the true and all-important relations between the Mosaic forms at large and the gospel realities—the relations which constituted the former as types of the latter. Let the defining principle be pondered. The Mosaic rites were types of New Testament things in the sense that *the two stood opposite to each other, each answering to each, in their respective spheres, and in their corresponding aims and ends*—that is, between them there was an *analogy*, a correspondence of relations or ratios. For illustration, as is the relation between the works of art and the human artist, so is the relation between the works of nature and the Artist divine. By analogy of metaphor, as is the relation between the cultivation of the scion and the growth of the tree, so is the relation between the instruction of youth and the unfolding of the mind. In like manner by analogy of ceremony, as is the washing in water to the cleansing of the flesh, so is the work of the Holy Spirit to the purification of the heart; and therefore that is a type of this. As was the sprinkling of blood to satisfaction for Jewish defilement, so is the sacrifice of the cross to the blotting out of sin. But be the correspondence of relations ever so strict, the one is by no means predictive of the other. The soaring of the eagle is often made analogous to the elevation of lofty discourse, but the former does not in any way even imply the latter.

In this very sense Paul again and again employs the word *type*; and at least in one place he does so in such a connection as to break down the theological distinction between the type and the antitype. “Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are

*antitypes* of the true' (Heb. 9 : 24). Here he inverts the theological order, and calls that the antitype which theology terms the type, and so implies that what is commonly termed the type may be called the antitype. This interchangeability of the correlated words accords exactly with our definition. Taking the type to be a thing analogous to the antitype, and the antitype also analogous to the type, the one stands over against the other and completes the analogy. It therefore matters not which way the relation may be traced, whether forward from the Old Testament to the New, or backward from the New to the Old. Provided the relation holds, say, between two transactions or characters, either term may be indifferently applied to both. In the passage cited, the apostle clearly means that the two sanctuaries were analogous things, the earthly standing over against the heavenly, not by any direct resemblance, but by a resemblance of relations.

Dr. A. A. Hodge ("Atonement") quotes John 19 : 36 : "This was done that the Scripture should be fulfilled. A bone of Him shall not be broken ;" and he adds : "The antitype must conform to the type." This is true. But, *first*, this conformity is not in direct resemblance. And the fact that not a bone of the Redeemer's body was broken—which is, indeed, in direct resemblance to the passover lamb—is rather a fulfilment of prophecy (Ps. 34 : 20). For if we insist upon any approach to a direct resemblance between the lamb of burnt-offering and the death of the Lord Jesus, it fails in almost every particular. Our Lord was nailed alive to the tree ; the lamb was slain with the knife, and afterward consumed on the altar. But while the comparison thus made utterly fails, the resemblance of relations is complete. *Secondly*, the incidental direct resemblance

in the case of the unbroken bones of the paschal lamb and of our Lord's body, even allowing this to be a correspondence of type to antitype, is vainly given by Dr. Hodge as a proof of the predictive force of the type. This cannot be shown from Scripture.

We are often told that the Babylon of the Old Testament, where Israel was held captive, "was a type" of something in the future, which should prove yet more oppressive to the Church; and the proof of this is found in the name, *Babylon*, applied to that ominous something (Rev. 17 : 5). The application of the old name to the then future mystery of iniquity does, indeed, prove the latter to be of the same class and character with the former; and in this sense the one is the type of the other; and the reapplication of the name is a beautiful method of declaring this. But to make more than this out of it—to represent the Babylon on the Euphrates as ordained to foreshow the Babylon of the Apocalypse—is without the least authority, and is absurd.

But other words are cited to prove the predictive character of the Jewish ceremonial. It was a "*shadow* of things to come" (Col. 2 : 17). To say the least, the notion of a shadow is a singularly vague idea to exhibit any reality yet in the darkness of the future. "That which doth make manifest is light." But let us note more particularly, first, that Paul's use of the word makes it strictly interchangeable with *pattern* and *figure*. (Compare Heb. 8 : 5 with 9 : 23 and 10 : 1.) Now these synonymous words confessedly contain no predictive force. In the next place, that which is called a shadow is never said to be a shadow of Christ, but of "good things to come"—that is, the Mosaic system, as a whole, was the counterpart of the Gospel dispensation in its entirety, feature answering to feature in each.

*Thirdly*, the apostle makes the term "shadow" antithetical with the word "body," in the sense of substance or reality. Now this antithesis clearly points away from the notion of *shadow* as predictive, and in a direction which makes it mean a counterpart or analogous fact. Thus the plan of a house on paper might properly be called its shadow, being its outline. In allusion to the resemblance which such an outline plan would have to the reality or "body" of the house, the ancient priesthood are said to "serve unto the shadows of heavenly things." The earthly was the counterpart of the heavenly, and the intent of the one corresponded to the intent of the other, while the two had by no means the same intent. But this correspondence could not have been even imagined till the heavenly was revealed.

Let us say in passing, this presentation of the point sets in a clear light the declaration, "The body is of Christ." To Him and His work relate all the realities of the gospel scheme, and He personally is the central reality of all that is real.

To go beyond the exposition now given, and insist on shadows being prophetic of coming realities, is wholly unwarrantable. The objector may insist that nothing is taught by the apostle's language if he does not teach that by shadows he means predictions of gospel facts. In proper place it will be seen that vastly important lessons were taught.

Moreover, the scope of the apostle's argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews does not require the citation of anything as prophetic in the Jewish ritual—does, indeed, hardly admit of this. The expounder who makes the apostles' citations to be those of prophecy actually turns away from the whole drift of his reasoning. But let the reader of that epistle apply the principle of *analogous*

*facts* to the argument, and he will be surprised at the logical force of Paul's method, and its fitness to meet the case of those to whom he writes. It irresistibly carries the Hebrew convert away from the outward and material, and turns his face toward the spiritual and heavenly. But just as far as this key—of analogy—is dropped, and the idea of types as predictions prevails, the apostle's argument becomes weak and inconclusive.

In dismissing this topic we may cite a passage which is commonly thought to present a very conspicuous example in proof that the types are strictly predictive—"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness," etc. That transaction was indeed a *type* of gospel salvation. But in what sense? Not in being predictive of the great atonement. There is not the slightest evidence that the thought of comparing the forthcoming event of Calvary with the older one of Jewish history ever entered a human soul till our Lord expressed the comparison to Nicodemus. And if it did not, of what avail was the serpent as a shadowy prediction? And how was it of any force as such on the mind of Jesus' hearer?

But it was the intent of our Lord to exhibit the very striking and to Nicodemus the very instructive parallel between the small event in the camp and the stupendous transaction of Calvary. And we can clearly see that the similitude—for similitude alone there was—conveyed volumes of truth to the Jewish rabbi, as it conveys volumes to all gospel hearers who are familiar with the Mosaic narrative. Accordingly the Master does not introduce that event by saying: "*Because* Moses lifted up," or by saying: "Thus it is written, and must be fulfilled;" but he introduces it in the true analogical form, employing the term "*as*." Here is the analogy in full, defining strictly the manner and intent of the



Redeemer's death : *As* the serpent was elevated for healing, *so* must Jesus be lifted up for a like end ; *as* the wounded Israelite was required to look, *so* the conscience-stricken sinner must believe ; and *as* the look of the bitten secured his cure, *so* the exercise of faith in Christ universally brings salvation. This is the lesson specifically taught—a lesson which fixes and stereotypes in all New Testament readers the principles of gospel salvation centering in the Atonement of the Cross ; and it utterly routs the motley host of Socinians, Arians, and humanitarians who make the death of Jesus “merely an inspiring example.” And as for Moses' people, although Christ was not preached to them by the serpent on the pole, a more seasonable thing was done for them. Those same great principles underlying the gospel facts were thereby inwrought in the Jewish mind. And so effectual was that event to fix those basic principles in Israel, that the record of it was most worthy the spirit of inspiration.

In review, then, we are entitled to say, first, this definition, making a type an analogous and not a predictive thing, admirably accords with the context wherever the term is found in the New Testament. This is far more than can be said of the usual understanding of the word. Those who attribute to it a prophetic force are constrained utterly to abandon this in nearly one half of the passages where the word is found. No violence can press the prophetic element into them. But wherever the same word is employed in connection with the same class of subjects—as the word *baptize* in the Christian ordinance—it must be taken in precisely the same sense. Accordingly, let the Bible reader adopt the idea of *analogical fact* as the sense of the word in question, and he finds himself possessed of a master key which fits completely, and works with ease wherever it is applied.

Secondly, this view relieves us from all perplexity as to what things and what persons in the Old Testament are typical of greater things and greater persons in the New. On this one subject many volumes have been written, and few of them have given more than a partial satisfaction, while some have excited simply contempt by their extravagance. And, indeed, while expositors cling to the common and erroneous definition of the term, their endeavor to keep on the line of prudence in admitting this and excluding that when searching the Hebrew Scriptures is an impracticable work. As well expect a seaman in crossing the ocean amid clouds and fogs, and without a compass, to keep strictly on a certain straight imaginary line. In this impossible task perhaps no scholar has succeeded better than Dr. Fairbairn in his "Typology." But, after all, it seems that the best that can be said of him is that he is "judicious," and even this is not said by all. And no wonder; for, starting out with an utterly wrong principle, he is guideless and bewildered amid a labyrinth of particulars. A learned divine, when lately discoursing before an immense and critical assembly, had occasion to refer to the act of Aaron and Hur in holding up the hands of Moses; and he expressed himself in doubt whether this was a type of a certain necessity in the Church. His doubt would have been dispelled if he had dismissed from his mind the erroneous idea that a type is a prophecy, and if he had taken the Apostle Paul as his guide. For example, in the Epistle to the Galatians (4 : 22-27), while the apostle does not employ either the word type or anti-type, his reasoning involves the Scripture sense of both. Referring to the birth of Abraham's two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, the one from a slave, the other from a free woman, he is careful to say that in employing the history

to set forth the two covenants, the facts are "*allegorized*" by him. In using this word he distinctly lets his readers know that he is not expounding the history, but employing it in the way of analogy ; for he immediately proceeds to draw out the resemblance of relations in a twofold direction. We may paraphrase his language : "*As* Hagar, the slave woman, brought forth her child in her own state of slavery, *so* the covenant of the law, centering in the earthly enthralled Jerusalem, and originating from Sinai (called Hagar in Arabic), worked spiritual bondage to all under that covenant." Also, "*As* the free woman brought forth her son in her own state of freedom, *so* the covenant of grace, centering in the free Jerusalem above, works spiritual liberty to all who are children of this covenant." This method may be universally applied wherever events or persons in the Old Testament stand in such analogical relation to gospel facts in the New, as stands the training of a youth to the cultivation of a tree. Hence, if the preacher above spoken of had taken the word *type* in its Bible sense of analogical resemblance, he could have had no doubt about his cited fact of history, and he would have had the good example of Paul to support him. Whatever in the Jewish Scripture is analogical with anything in the New Testament, the same is a type, and nothing else is.

## CHAPTER VII.

### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

OWING to the extent to which this essay traverses the generally accepted view, and because of the manner in which this view enters into the devotional reading of the Old Testament, there should be a prompt and respectful consideration of objections to our exposition.

1. It may be objected that the view now presented reduces the Mosaic rites, as employed by the Christian teacher, to the level of mere illustrations. Thus to suppose is to miss the whole drift of the writer. This objection really lies rather against the common view ; and, as a fact, many holding to that view seem to find no better use for the record of the Jewish rites than to make them illustrative of gospel truths. And numbers slide into this practice because the view taken is superficial, and the usage is cheap, and comes easily in hand.

The exposition now given shows the typology of the Altar to be a matter less obvious to the casual reader. That always is so which leads us beneath the surface. But if our exposition is understood, it exhibits the types as far enough from being simply illustrations, however complete. An illustration merely sheds light on a doctrine already defined and established ; a type actually determines the shape of the doctrine throughout. An illustration leaves the form of the doctrine as it finds it, only in clearer light ; a type leaves its impress upon it as really as the mould of the iron-worker leaves its inner

shape on the molten metal cast into it. Plato fancied that the whole round of the material universe of necessity took form from certain primordial and potent ideas eternally going before, those ideas being the type, the universe the antitype. See the like of this fully realized in the form of gospel doctrine under the impress of the Mosaic types !

2. We shall hear that our doctrine destroys the unity of the Bible, inasmuch as it seems to exclude Christ, the centre of that unity, from a large part of the sacred writings.

The Scriptures are certainly one, having a single theme and one and the same aim throughout. Moreover, Christ is the one central object from whom all lines of Scriptural thought radiate, and in whom all doctrines find their consummation.

But it betrays a very narrow view of Bible oneness to demand for it that Christ shall not only be equally, but in pretty much the same way, in all parts of Revelation—in the Book of Numbers no less than in the gospel according to Matthew. A remarkable example of this assumption is seen in a modern commentary on the Book of Proverbs. The author, dissatisfied with having that book teach mainly good morals and “the fear of the Lord,” determines to make it of the same substance with the most evangelical parts of Scripture. According to this author, the gospel must be the theme, and there throughout he resolves to find Christ and every gospel grace. “The strange woman” is impenitence ! The cry of “wisdom” is the call of the gospel to repentance and faith ; and so through all the isolated maxims of the Proverbs. It is needless to say that this kind of assumption, anticipating the word of God, and determining what it must contain, is always a disqualification for prop-

erly understanding the Bible. And as to the notion that Christ must be equally in all parts of the Scripture, in order to the unity of Revelation, it is a supposition violent and wholly unnecessary. Where is there a unity more complete in its way than that presented in the human individual? But in order to complete oneness here, is it necessary to suppose that the head—the glory of the body—somehow pervades the chest and different limbs? Or must it be that the soul—a part utterly diverse from the corporal frame—diffuses itself through the arms and legs, so as to blend the whole in one? How absurd! Yet almost equally so the persuasion that because the Bible is one, meaning Christ and salvation, therefore Christ must be read as really in the names of the books of Chronicles as in the narrative of the crucifixion.

As to the effort to find Christ really and in the gospel sense in all parts of the Bible, this is confessedly abortive. In the Book of Judges and in most of the subsequent history of the kings of Judah and Israel, even the most strenuous allegorizers find but few grains of gospel gold. As a signal example of this kind of failure, see a small London volume entitled “The Gospel in the Book of Joshua.”

Unity is not reiteration. It is just the reverse. In the noble monument that rises from the level of the ground up into the air there is a unity so complete as to exclude severely certain details ever so small, whether in the statue above, on the shaft below, or even in the base at your feet. But who would say that because strict unity is here, the expression the sex or the drapery of the surmounting statue must in some way penetrate all parts of the monument, even the foundation underground?

3. Our view will give offence to a more pious sentiment—namely, the believer's desire to meditate always on Christ, His love, His suffering. Christian experience and Christian practice and enjoyment are all consummated right at the cross. To the believer Christ is "the one altogether lovely." He never wearies of the recital of his Redeemer's excellence. He delights to revolve this in his thoughts. He places it before him in every possible aspect. He views it in every available light; and any aid to his meditations which will give novelty and freshness to the charming theme he catches at with religious avidity.

But even this religiousness, like everything human, may fall into error by running to certain extremes. We need not be told it was this sentiment which first introduced the crucifix into churches. And right here is the origin of much in "practical" commentaries, and in those biblical expositions which draw the honey of the gospel out of the last place where sober reason would expect to find it—in the dry skeleton bones of the details of the ceremonial code. The writers of these, contemplating the tree of life, are not content to have the root furnish nourishment to the branches, and the trunk to give support to the whole; but while fruit hangs in abundance and within easy reach on the boughs, where alone rational persons would look for it, these good people insist on gathering it direct from the trunk also, and no less from even the roots beneath the ground! But, after all, the piety which is fed on gospel lessons far fetched from the drapery of Moses' ritual is not likely to be of the most sturdy kind. It is too near akin to the pietism of Rome, which is nurtured by gazing on crosses and pictures. Practical religion, to answer the substantial ends of life, must be based square upon the plain

facts of gospel history. It must take direct hold on the living, personal Christ of the evangelists. And are not the four evangelists sufficient? But if insufficient, what more does the allegorizing of the ritual law add to them? It adds not one gospel fact. It presents no new shade of gospel truth. It quits the region of solid reality on which alone a genuine faith can rest; and it launches out on the unstable sea of fancy. When men have learned all that the New Testament and the Prophets contain of Christ crucified, they have learned enough for this present world.

4. This amiable desire to find Christ equally in all parts of the Bible reappears in a more general form when we hear it alleged that "the Scriptures are throughout spiritual in their contents." This proper assumption of spirituality becomes the occasion of forcing the rites of Moses to preach the doctrine of the cross. The expounders we refute cannot allow that ritual to fall short of this; "for," say they, "to do so would imply a want of spirituality in large portions of the Bible."

But what is the meaning of this word *spiritual*? It properly means that which relates to the spirit or soul. It includes true morals fully as much as it does evangelical doctrine. It embraces "the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and fidelity"—no less than it comprises pardon and reconciliation through Christ. "The law is spiritual." To discourse from the pulpit in a Christian way on the duty of men to pay their honest debts is quite as spiritual as to preach the doctrine of the atonement, and it may be often more seasonable. If a preacher, aiming at the honor of Christ, takes up the subject of temperance rather than the doctrine of sanctification, he is not to be called any the less spiritual on that account. Nay, if he exhorts to



temperance, speaking in a Christ-like way, he is much more spiritual than the man who preaches sanctification in a controversial temper. This is often forgotten or denied. And it is lamentable that many think the further the Bible expounder gets away from the homely practical virtues of the every-day life of Christians, while drawing near to the doctrinal peculiarities of the Christian faith, the more spiritual he is. It is by this kind of spirituality many forget to be fair, temperate, and true. Let this misused word, *spiritual*, be rightly understood, and it will not be necessary to force the atonement of the cross into the Book of Leviticus in order to make it spiritual. The book will be equally entitled to this designation if it revived in the human soul the lost ideas of the holiness of God, the pollution of sin, and of the need of pardon and cleansing. This was emphatically the spirituality needed in Moses' day, and for centuries thereafter. Why should the Book of Proverbs be wrested into an evangelical document like the Epistle to the Ephesians, when at the time of its composition there was an imperative demand for a real spiritual knowledge of common, every-day principles of morals? Was it of no importance spiritually to show lewd and ignorant men the sin of lewdness and the depth of that "pit;" that "the strange woman" must be spiritualized into impenitence under a preached gospel? Was the unspirituality of sloth, of theft, of removing of landmarks, and the numerous other crimes reproved in that book—was this all nothing, that the plain warnings on those subjects must be metamorphosed into rebukes of sin against the gospel?

The process through which the Song of Solomon has been taken is a remarkable example of this spiritualizing. Without one very decided proof affirming it, and with a

multitude of things looking in another direction, "the bride is the Church, and the bridegroom is Christ," and the conjugal affection there celebrated "is the mutual love of Christ and His Church." But what must become of the bride of Christ and her affection for Him, if the degradation of bigamy and the vileness of even polygamy are to remain rife, unremoved and unrebuked among even the religious? Here was a corrupt running sore which was eating out all piety in domestic life. To rebuke this evil, to put a stigma upon it by celebrating the excellence and purity of God's primitive institution of one woman for one man, would seem to have been then a necessary and truly spiritual work—a work altogether worthy of the spirit of inspiration. And Solomon was the very man to pen it, for he had a bitter experience of the sin rebuked. But those who spiritualize the Song into a gospel full of Christ, seem to overlook the reeking pool of pollution which then spread out where the pure, clear stream of family affection should have flowed; or they appear to suppose it could and did cure itself! In some parts of our own land to-day, just as in Turkey, a chief spiritual need in family life is an application of Solomon's Song in its literal sense; and in some of our city pulpits it would prove a palpable hit, while not at all inconsistent with the spirituality of the sanctuary.

The doctrine of the one proper sense of Scripture is always truly spiritual, and as it was the needed spiritual doctrine for the time in which it was delivered, so precisely of the doctrine of Moses touching incense, peace-offering, and offerings for sin. Although these had in them no preaching of Christ, they exactly met the condition of men's minds and hearts, as lost to a sense of sin and guilt, and blind to their need of mercy and cleans-

ing. They contained, therefore, pre-eminently the spirituality which ancient Israel most needed.

But why should expounders make that only to be spiritual which is evangelical? Even in those four books which, by way of eminence, are called Evangelists are many things which are not at all distinctive of the cross of Christ. Witness the Sermon on the Mount, and mark the precepts against swearing, resisting evil, and putting away wives "for every cause." Nobody ever thinks of "spiritualizing" these so as to bring the atonement out of them, or justification by faith. Nobody complains that, without the essence of gospel doctrine as their scope, they are unspiritual. If, then, even in the Evangelists there is read that which is not strictly evangelistic, shall we object because we find the same thing true back in the Book of Numbers? And because we find no gospel there, shall it be charged that we rob that book of its spirituality? The perversion of a word is no basis for a sound argument.

5. It is further objected that we must believe that the gospel was truly preached to the generations of ancient Israel, and we must suppose this was done by the ritual service which formed so large a part of their worship. If by this it is meant that the repentant Israelite was encouraged to hope in the mercy of God, we need not question it; for a proclamation of mercy was made even to the sinners before the flood (1 Pet. 3 : 19). The people of Israel had always a sufficient knowledge of the way of life through divine mercy, and this they obtained chiefly from the teaching of their prophets. Again and again they were assured that repentance and trust in God led to the divine favor, and that the Messiah, to whom they were taught to look, would in due time reveal to His people a more full knowledge of salvation.

But it is yet true that the great design of the old economy and of everything peculiar to it was not chiefly the salvation of that people in their generations. Its purpose was rather to train and drill them, and so, through the centuries of their schooling, to lift them to that point of fitness which would make the gospel, when it came, available through them for all nations. They were made so to stand religiously that the Christian Church might stand evangelically on their shoulders. Before the fire of gospel grace could kindle in the green material taken direct from the forest of the degraded world, the material needed to be prepared to make it ignitable. But this done, it not only flamed forth in due time under the dispensation of the Spirit, but also availed to communicate the spiritual fire to the cold and unpromising material of the heathen world around it. In the wisdom of God the wisdom of the Greeks was made, on another line, to conduce to the same end (1 Cor. 1 : 21).

6. Objection is also derived from the declaration that "the law was fulfilled in Christ." This truth is in no wise to be obscured. "All things must be fulfilled spoken by Moses" (Luke 24 : 44). But what is the scriptural idea of fulfilling? Does it imply that Christ, as well as all gospel truth, is wrapped up in the ceremonial code, and that the fulfilling of this is the unwrapping of it in such a way as to get all gospel things out of it? To fulfil is an idea of large import; it is to *fill out*, to consummate. The Scriptures speak of the fulfilment of times, of works, of joy, etc. As Bacon has said, "Divine prophecies have *steps* and *grades* of fulfilment through all ages." But if this be true of prophecy, equally does it hold of law, moral and ceremonial. Christ fulfils the prophecies by realizing their predictions of Him. He fulfils also the moral code;

but this does not imply that Christ crucified was somehow in that code, as He was assuredly in prophecy. In most cases where the word is used there is no idea of developing from within what was always there, as the fruit and flower are developed from the bud. Least of all is the fulfilment of the ceremonial law like the unrolling of a scroll which tells of Christ, the writing all being there before, and the fulfilment simply bringing it out to view. Christ did fulfil that law, and yet not educe from it the doctrine of His person. As will be shown at large, the ceremonial law was preparatory to Christ and the gospel, just as the ancient throwing up of a highway was preparatory to the coming of a king who was to pass over it. But as this throwing up might go forward without an intimation of the personage for whom it was constructed, so neither is the doctrine of Christ's presence in the ceremonial code which prepared the way for Him. That narrow notion attached to the word *fulfil* is not scriptural.

7. Finally, it is objected on theological grounds that ancient Israel could not have been left ignorant of the one gospel way of salvation ; and as the knowledge of this was necessary, and as the ritual of Moses was the daily and prominent feature in their public worship—corresponding to preaching now—they must thereby have had this needful knowledge conveyed to them. In reply these following points may be made :

(a) It may be doubted if any large part of ancient Israel ever attained to a practical knowledge of a personal Redeemer ; and those who did obtained it from another source than the covenant of Sinai. The conversion of the heart formed no part of the covenant made by Jehovah with the Jewish people under the old economy. (See Jer. 31 : 31-33.) Eternal salvation in the

Jewish Church was supra-Mosaic. It was on the same basis from the time of Abel, Enoch, and Abraham. It was sealed by circumcision, which "was not of Moses, but of the fathers." What then, it may be asked, was the advantage of the Mosaic covenant, and of the service enjoined under it? "Much every way." But while there were rich advantages in the religious inheritance of the Jew, it must be reaffirmed that the chief outlook of that religion was not toward the salvation of that people then and there. "The law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did" (Heb. 7 : 19). The aspect and drift of Judaism were, through that people, toward the Christian Church, and thence through this toward the salvation of the world. "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect" (Heb. 11 : 40). The young tree is not made perfect till the season in which it bears fruit. We stand upon the shoulders of the Jewish people, and by means of the elevation they have given us we are enabled to discern the heavenly Canaan—an object generally beyond their sight (Rom. 11 : 30). In brief, so very degraded had the whole human race become, that it was expedient to select one family from the general mass, and, by a long and laborious training, bring this family upward to that point at which converting truth could be largely efficacious, and at which the converting Spirit could seasonably descend and work. During all those earlier centuries the leaven must be prepared which was to pervade the nations. Hence, not till Jesus ascended to heaven did the Spirit "come and convince the world of sin" (John 16 : 18). For the maturing of certain crops it is necessary that the young plants be first brought forward in a seed-plot, whence they are afterward transplanted to the open field. But

not till then is it expected that fruit will be found. Such a seed-plot was the Jewish Church, with its manifold rites of service. The mature fruit—genuine conversion—was not there generally gathered. This view would seem to be the only one that will “vindicate the ways of God to men,” in that He for ages suffered all nations to walk in their own ways” (Acts 14 : 16). For, “Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles” (Rom. 3 : 29)?

(b) While there are certain truths which must be known in order to salvation, there are others also closely connected with the work of redemption; and while there is a vast advantage in knowing these, this knowledge is not absolutely essential to the person saved. Of the former class are the existence of God and His moral law, also the reality of sin, an assurance of mercy to the repentant who trust in the promise of forgiveness, and no less a revealed pledge of help in some way laid upon one who is able to save. These truths bear direct upon the heart, and without a knowledge of them no man can be moved to sorrow, love, and hope. Belonging to the other class are those truths which specially relate to the channel through which spiritual blessings descend on men. From a known friend you may receive a valuable gift, and coming from him as a gratuity you may learn to be thankful for it, the more so as you are made to know how little you deserve it. But precisely how much this gift cost your friend, or what particularly was laid down to procure it, you may not be given to understand. Did you know this also, it might stir you to greater admiring gratitude. But a knowledge of this is not essential to some degree of devotion. Such pious men as Enoch; Job, and Moses, knowing their own sinfulness and God’s mercy, were enabled to repent. And having a

promise of forgiveness and help through an agency of which they knew but little, they learned to hope in God ; and hoping in Him who thus promised to be gracious, they rendered to Him the return of grateful hearts ; and this is the very essence of piety. All this comes out fully in the devotional parts of the Old Testament, and such was the genuine piety of many under the dispensation of Moses. But it remained for the New Testament revelation of the " great mystery of godliness" to make known to the pious that the price of their redemption was no other and no less than the blood of God's own Son, shed strictly as an atonement for sin. By the proclamation of this wonderful truth pious gratitude is intensified and devotion to God is made both more warm and far more general throughout the Church.

(c) From the earliest times the Jewish people were so far instructed in the doctrine of a Saviour as to show Him to be the proper object of their trust, and to Him they looked for deliverance. But so far as Moses taught, it cannot be shown that the salvation of the angel of Jehovah was not rather a temporal and national deliverance. " Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day." But if he saw anything in that day beyond the glory conferred on his posterity by the Messiah, it does by no means appear. Least of all can we learn that the patriarch saw anything whatever of the method by which that glory of salvation was to be secured through the promised Deliverer. The process by which all those ancient worthies are made adepts in New Testament theology is wholly unwarrantable. Neither is this in the least necessary. He who trusts to God's anointed for *any* good has the essence of that genuine faith whose certain outcome covers his whole case for time and eternity.



In the later periods of the Jewish Church that people were gradually instructed more fully touching the character and work of their own Messiah ; that He was to be a great King on the throne of David, and also a High Priest making intercession for the guilty ; that He was to be really Divine, and truly a man ; that He would put forth an almighty power for the deliverance of His people ; that He was, moreover, to suffer in their behalf—He personally afflicted and smitten to an extent that men would conclude that God had turned against Him—would be pierced in his hands and his feet ; that he would even die in furtherance of the great work of Israel's redemption. And beyond this it was taught by the prophets that this suffering Redeemer would endure these great pains in some way because of the iniquities of His people, and even that He would take their corrections upon Himself, and by virtue of this intervention they would enjoy exemption and abounding blessing.

These predictions had their Old Testament culmination in the Prophet Isaiah. And it is to be remembered that the people to whom Moses gave law had, in their generations, gone more than seven hundred years—fully a half of that legal dispensation—before the evangelic prophet “delivered his wonderful message of mercy to Israel.” So then, while on the one hand these fuller revelations touching the Messiah were superabundant for all the necessities of a reasonable faith, on the other hand, they were given far too late, supposing them to be the key to the ancient service of the Altar, as though that service was “a symbolic preaching of Christ.”

That one utterance of the Baptist on the bank of the Jordan : “Behold *the Lamb of God* which taketh away the sin of the world,” if it were found in the Pentateuch,

and read in connection with the institution of the Altar, would be more decisive of this point than all that Moses ever wrote. But "among those that are born of woman there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist," Isaiah himself not excepted.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE COMMON VIEW FRAUGHT WITH EVILS.

THE general practice of forcing an evangelical sense on the symbols of Judaism is a grave error, fraught with serious consequences in several directions.

1. Not the least of these consequences is the breaking down of the sharp antithesis which the New Testament carefully maintains between the law and the gospel. The entire round of the ceremonial code belongs strictly to what, in the Old Testament, is called "the law." And that modern distinctions between the moral and ceremonial, made as though one was more law than the other, was wholly unknown to the Jewish mind. It is equally foreign to the writers of the New Testament. The sum total of the ordinances, including washings, sacrifices, and all that pertained to the tabernacle, is there denominated *law*, equally and in common with the decalogue. And in the argumentative parts of the Christian Scriptures this classification is, with much reason, studiously kept up; for otherwise the all-important difference between what is law and what is gospel would speedily disappear. Mark how Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, contrasts the law with the gospel, emphasizing the fact that "the law is not of faith." And he is led to draw the contrast sharply because of the dangerous manner in which the Galatian churches confounded law with grace, and mingled legalism with their gospel obedience. By blotting out the clear distinction between

the two, and by passing partly over from the latter to the former, they "fell away from grace."

But if we interpret the Jewish cleansings and offerings of blood to have been a preaching of Christ, the Bible antithesis between the law and the gospel is broken down, and we invite to a practical error to which the Church has ever been prone—that of invoking legal rites and forms to supplement the grace of God. If the *recital* of Jewish rites be an exhibition of Christ, then the *acting out* of those rites would seem to be only a step farther in the same direction. Thus it is argued in the communion of Rome; and there they have incense, sprinklings of salt, and "the bloodless sacrifices of the mass;" and all this they call a gospel service. That emblemizing which finds the whole gospel in the legal forms of Moses is strictly a putting of new wine into old bottles.

This procedure, moreover, is a practical denial of the words of Paul. He shows that "the law worketh wrath." This is true of all the law. It holds of all the law just as it is, and as it was meant to be understood, and not merely as misused by Judaizing teachers. But to give an evangelical turn to a great part of the law is to reverse all this and make it the harbinger of peace and joy. For if the ceremonial law means Christ, so far is it from "working wrath" that the more of it is exhibited the more of joy and peace must follow.

2. If the ceremonial of the Altar be "a glass reflecting Christ and His salvation," it must be pronounced defective and misleading in one most practical particular. The gospel is effectual for the chief of sinners. "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." To prevent despair and to foster hope, especially in the vilest who repent, the gospel assures them that though their

"sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow." Theft, murder, rebellion, blasphemy, and every crime of high degree are met by the proclamation, "Whosoever will, let him come."

But assuming that the Altar ritual means the grace of the gospel, do we find this abounding grace therein? If it be a preaching of Christ it ought by all means to be there. "The chief of sinners"—as most penitents esteem themselves to be, and as many really are—need most the explicit assurance of mercy. And, as in the case of Paul, "a blasphemer and injurious," God is especially glorified in their pardon and cleansing. If, therefore, this be wanting in the sacrificial system, it is defective both as a preached and a predicted gospel, just where it should be most clear and emphatic. If the very characters whom the gospel specifically encourages be shut out from mercy by the limitations of the ritual code, how can that ritual be an annunciation of gospel mercy? Yet when we turn to the record we find no provision whatever made for murder, wilful theft, idolatry, witchcraft, rebellion, or indeed any of the graver offences against the decalogue. "If a man come presumptuously on his neighbor and slay him with guile, thou shalt take him away from My Altar that he may die." There was no offering provided to meet his case, however penitent he might be. "The gospel according to Leviticus" was not to be preached to him. The sacrifices were all ordained to expiate only "trespasses" against the ritual, to remove ceremonial uncleanness, to make amends for mistakes, or at most for the ordinary moral imperfections of the people.

Inasmuch, then, as the law of sacrifices, viewed as a holding forth of Christ, is lacking just where it should be most full and explicit—it being wholly wanting here—

we are justly entitled to conclude it is not a holding forth of Christ at all.

This deficiency is seen by Dr. Fairbairn, and he attempts to parry it by showing that, in the New Testament, gospel grace is not available for the persistently impenitent. But this is to confound two things entirely different—namely, the case of the hardened reprobate who never asks for mercy and that of the criminal who confesses and deplures, as did Saul of Tarsus. This method of escape from the difficulty betrays the weakness of the position which demands it. Because of the wickedness of Eli's sons, the Lord swore that "the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering forever." Was that whole family in its generations cut off from the benefits of a preached Gospel? It is not to be believed.

3. To make the ritual of the Altar a preaching of the gospel contravenes the apostle's reason for its abrogation. It was abrogated "because of the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." "It made nothing perfect" (Heb. 7 : 18 and 10 : 2)—that is, it did not save the souls of the worshippers. This cannot be said of any method of gospel preaching that God ordains. The gospel as now preached tells of Christ having come; thy ritual, according to many, told of Christ about to come. But the proclamation of a Saviour, however made, could never be "weak and unprofitable." As when made by Paul it was "the power of God unto salvation," so, just as really, it was the same power when made by the Jewish Altar, if made there at all.

We may here be met with the plea that the "fault" divinely complained of was not in the service itself, but in the wilful unbelief of the worshippers, who refused to see the gospel salvation set before them. That Israel

made a wrong use of their Altar service we must allow. But if the plea now recited were in point, the correction of the fault would not have been in the abolition of the system, but in an insisting on an acceptance of the gospel realities supposed to be preached by the sacrifices. The like correction is now often made when men fail to apprehend Christ in their hearing of the Word.

But the sacred writer is decisive on this point. He explicitly declares that service "could not make the consciences perfect." He is yet more explicit: "If that first covenant had been faultless, there should no place have been sought for the second." It was therefore set aside, not because the service was misunderstood, but because of what it was in and of itself. It was no doubt faultless for all the ends for which it was given, just as the delineation of a dwelling on paper may be faultless for the ends for which it is drafted. But it is a nullity for any intent for which a real house is built—it can afford no shelter, it cannot be a home, it has nothing substantial. So neither did the ritual of Moses set forth any of the substantial facts centering in the person of Christ. It did not say *He* was to die, or that *His* death was to be an atonement, or that the Jewish worshipper should therein behold *Him* as the Lamb of God. After the most sincere Israelite drank in all the spirituality his sin-offerings afforded him, he needed to look to other and higher teachings to secure his eternal salvation.

But when we view the ritual of the Altar purely as a school drilling in the elementary truths *underlying* the gospel, Paul's words appear beautifully and forcibly in place. To employ yet again the apostle's own simile of "rudiments"—the letters of the alphabet and all mere syllabic sounds are truly weak and unprofitable if kept and recited where we first learn them. They convey no

lessons of wisdom. They must indeed be conned, but only because of the use to which they are thereafter to be turned. But the conning being complete, the spelling-book of the law, while it must by no means be forgotten, should give place to the reader setting forth the wonderful story of Bethlehem and of Calvary.

4. The mode of interpretation here combatted not only violates but completely overturns the important doctrine of the orderly unfolding of revealed truth in the Word of God. As in the Church, so in the Scriptures, it is "first the blade ; after that, the ear ; then the full corn in the ear." And this law of progression in the Church makes the same law divinely wise in the Bible, whereby the primary and more simple truths, and those first needed, are first presented, followed by those which naturally come after, and crowned finally by the unfolding, in the New Testament, of what are called "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." These highest and last are, "God manifest in the flesh," atonement through His blood, sanctification by the same, and other gospel truths of a kindred sort. But long before the world was ready for these, "the hidden wisdom," there was a necessary training in matters which must go before. Mankind must be shown there is such a thing as moral purity. They needed to be taught they were guilty before God. They required to have it impressed upon them that they could come into favor with their Creator only through His mercy and forgiveness, and that their dependence upon His grace is absolute. Upon opening the Bible we discover that this order is observed with the greatest strictness and consistency. First of all, the world was taught—what it had forgotten—that there is but one God ; that He is the Creator of all ; that He is holy and just as well as Almighty ; and that He will



punish the guilty and forgive the penitent. Thus the spirit of inspiration advances from truth to truth, till the spiritual temple is complete and the sacred furniture is finally arranged within it.

Dr. A. A. Hodge, when vainly proceeding to prove the offerings of the Jewish Altar to be prophetic of Christ, lays down his proposition in these words: "The sacrifices of the law were typical of the sacrifice of Christ—that is, the principles of vicarious and piacular suffering upon which they proceeded are identical with those upon which, by one sacrifice for sin, He hath forever perfected them that are sanctified" ("Atonement," p. 143). It is evident that he regards the latter part of this double proposition as a mere expansion and explanation of the former part. It is strange he should so regard it, if, as his argument requires, he gives to the word "typical" the sense of *predictive*; for in the explanatory addition to his first statement he presents in fact a very different thing—a thing which is none other than the important truth contended for in this essay. And while the first division of his proposition is at war with the law of doctrinal progress in the Bible, the second part beautifully accords with that law. For among the earlier truths of revelation, coming after the doctrine of one God, and of sin and guilt, are "*the principles of vicarious and piacular suffering.*" This part of his statement is claimed as a central doctrine of the present treatise; and if this be what he means by "typical," he utters an exact and important truth, and the divine order of revelation receives no violence. Principles must ever underlie the specific truths which are to rest on them. Men should get some idea of atonement before the atonement by Christ is preached to them.

From this wise and beautiful order of procedure in the

Scriptures there has been drawn a just and powerful argument in behalf of the divinity of the Bible ; and this argument has been elaborated until it has become one of the citadels in the defences of the Christian religion.

But the method of allegorizing, we now consider, demolishes this stronghold, by turning into chaos the divine order of disclosure in the sacred books. It drags in among the elementary teachings of patriarchal times the most advanced doctrines of the mature period of the New Testament. What is spoken of as the "first gospel promise" (Gen. 3 : 14) cannot be cited against us here ; neither can anything in all the prophets. In that passage in Genesis nothing is revealed but the simple fact of a future crushing victory by a *man* over the serpent's brood. This one fact is given in transparent language, and nothing is hinted as to what that victory was to be, or how it was to be brought about. The manner of the prophets is not different from this. They do indeed become clearer, with the advance of the Church through the ages. In them also "God foresaw some better thing for us." Even the "evangelic" Isaiah, while advancing beyond all who went before him, and telling of Him by whose "stripes we are healed," leaves both the manner and the matter of this gracious interposition very much in the dark.

The emblematicizers invert the whole order of this elementary and progressive teaching. They make Moses, who indeed as a prophet "wrote of Christ"—they make even him, and that too in his law, give the gospel in all its details. Nay, they find him going beyond the fulness of the New Testament. Meeting so many particulars in the sacrificial code, and having entered on the task of making each and every one of them predictive of something in Christ's character and work, they are driven to

suppose—or fancy—numerous things to be true of Him of which the New Testament says nothing at all.

Still worse, while insisting on the discovery, on the earlier pages of the Bible, of doctrines which, as an apostle declares, “were hidden from the ages” (Col. 1 : 26), and even the discovery of features touching which the gospels are silent, these fanciful expounders tell us those doctrines are there “only dimly shadowed forth.” Here we have a double inversion of the natural order. While the later and crowning truths, and other things besides, are forced into the beginning, there is also in the beginning—instead of in the end, where it could be better understood—an alleged peculiar obscurity of manner. By this double inversion the wisdom of God in the method of the Scriptures is set at naught. Mr. Barnes, on the last chapter of Hebrews, says : “Every reader of the Old Testament *needs* such a guide as this epistle to settle the principles of the Jewish economy.” But what of the Jew who had to act, as the Christian has not, on these bare principles ? As he was required to act on them with at least some understanding, and being blinder than Christian readers, how much greater his need of a New Testament key, if the ritual was predictive ! The “needed guide” is conferred on us who, for a twofold reason, least need it ; and withheld from those who, for a twofold reason, needed it most ! Over against this it may be declared that whatever God meant to reveal to Israel He revealed at least quite as plainly to them as He has revealed the greater truths of the Gospel to us. Shall we be reminded there were many prophecies delivered to Israel the scope of which they could not understand ? But those prophecies did not lie at the basis of the daily worship. And again, as far as the Lord addressed those prophecies to the Jewish people, and for

their guidance, they could understand them. And no more than this can be said of the present Christian Church. We can understand the prophecies of the Bible only in part, for they have an endless reach and a continual outgoing from age to age. The ground principles of their worship were given plainly to Israel ; the vitalizing of those principles, which is given by bringing a living Christ into them, is conferred on us.

5. When the allegorical manner of exposition is once understood it suffers no bound ; it runs riot, fantastically dressing up in a Christian garb every item of the Jewish ritual. This method, being without Bible warrant, and having no established laws of interpretation, speedily becomes utterly extravagant. To verify this charge, two very different books are here cited, one of them a representative of the strictly theological class, the other a very popular devotional commentary. The latter is "Notes on Leviticus," by C. H. McIntosh. Open at any page : "The breast and shoulder" of the burnt-offering "are emblematic of love and power" ("Notes on Leviticus," p. 68). "The most excellent portion of the sacrifice was laid on God's altar ; the inward parts—the hidden energies of the blessed Jesus" (p. 67). "The meat-offering presents in a very distinct manner the man Christ Jesus. As the burnt-offering typifies Christ in death, the meat offering typifies Him in *life*" (p. 28). "It was baked in a pan. The process of baking suggests the idea of suffering" (!) (p. 55). "The bright beams of Christ's personal glory shining out from amid the awful gloom of Calvary, God's delight in the one from whom He had hid His face—all this is set forth in the fact that the *fat* of the sin-offering was burnt upon the altar" (! !) (p. 111). "He shall add a *fifth part* to the ram of the trespass-offering. Here we have a feature of the true

trespass-offering which, it is to be feared, is but little appreciated. In the work of the cross, God has not merely received back what was lost, but thereby He is an actual gainer. Here is a stupendous truth" (p. 126).

Turn now to that classic theological work, Witsiu's "Economy of the Covenants." In Book III., ch. 6, we are told that the ark of the covenant, being partly of wood and partly of gold, set forth the two natures in Christ, and that the wood being of a most durable kind indicated that our Lord's human flesh saw no corruption. The staves put in the four corners of the ark signified that Christ should be carried, by the preaching of the Gospel, to the four corners of the earth. "The ends of the staves being seen in the holy place signified that Christ, though in heaven, yet reveals Himself to the eyes of our faith!"

Most of this is sufficiently wild. Even plain men and women, trained in a belief that Christ is in these symbols, become weary of this kind of thing; and, as we have known to be the fact, with disgust they close the book largely made up of such fancies. In the learned work last named there is a discussion (Book III.), running through twenty-six sections, determining how Christ and His redemption were in the ceremony of the scapegoat. If any reader is curious to witness the flights and gyrations of fancy to which sober and learned men are impelled by a strong principle of interpretation, he may see it there to his full satisfaction. In that discussion there are as many conflicting gospel versions of the ceremony, and by as many different renowned divines, as there are sections in the chapter; and yet, on the principle assumed, all twenty-six of them are equally true and authentic! One man's fancy is as authoritative as another's.

This imaginative method of explaining the Word, if once admitted, knows no stopping-place. Having dealt violently with the symbols of the Bible, it will certainly proceed, as it has often done, to manipulate the parables, and even the history, and finally the plainest statements of doctrine. Thus has been introduced the theory of a "double sense" running through all Scripture and ending in the vagaries of Swedenborg. When the expounder quits the lowly posture of the question, What is here the mind of the Spirit? and when he forgets that the words of the Spirit are addressed to men's common sense, there is no telling where he will stop. He is no longer an inquirer after the will of God, but a moulder anew of the material that inspiration has given.

6. Perhaps, worst of all, this forced method gives rise to a cloud of doubt which spreads out before the Bible reader's eyes, let him turn to what page he may of "Notes on Leviticus." Let even a meditative Christian read as follows, and what his thought? "The ceremonial act of flaying was peculiarly expressive. It tends to set forth the depths of Christ's devotedness to the Father. It was no mean surface work with him," etc. (C. H. M., "Leviticus," p. 21). "The shadow of this perfect man passes before us in the 'fine flour'" (p. 34). "'And cut it in his pieces.' The Holy Ghost delights to dwell on the sweetness of Christ's sacrifice, not only as a whole, but in all its minute parts" (p. 21). "'And the sons of Aaron shall put the fire upon the altar'—a striking type of the Church having fellowship with God" (p. 23). "'His inwards and legs wash in water'—a most perfect correspondence between Christ's motives and His outward conduct" (p. 25). "The *burnt* offering is an atonement, not according to the depths and enormity of human guilt, but ac-

according to the perfection of Christ's surrender of Himself to God" (p. 20). The thoughtful man, on reading comments like these, is forced to say: "Well, if such be the import of the words and the meaning of the service, the Bible must be a book so vaguely mystical that anything whatever may be drawn from a great part of it." Thus is common sense staggered in view of the divine Word. Here again very apt is the language of that high authority on Biblical learning (the *Princeton Review*, January, 1848, p. 103): "All this confusion and uncertainty arises from assuming that the significant rites of the ceremonial law must of necessity be types—that is to say, prophetic symbols, and that they must necessarily be types of Christ. As soon as we admit that it is equally consistent with the honor of the Saviour, and still more consistent with the general purpose of the old economy as a preparatory dispensation, to explain a large portion of its forms as doctrinal symbols, teaching general truths of great importance, suited to the actual condition of the people, and tending to prepare them for a clearer revelation, several obvious interpretations spontaneously suggest themselves." Here is the whole truth in a nutshell, though the writer fails to catch the scriptural import of the word *type*.

7. This process brings the Scriptures into disrepute. As is aptly said by Rev. A. Barnes: "No one acquainted with the history of interpretation can doubt that vast injury has been done by a fanciful mode of explaining the Old Testament, by making every pin and pillar a type, and every fact in its history an allegory. Nothing is better fitted to bring the science of interpretation into contempt, nothing more dishonors the Bible than to make it a book of enigmas. The Bible is a book of sense" ("On Galatians," ch. 4).

Where good people are harmed, unbelievers may have "occasion" to speak reproachfully. The most scurrilous defamer of the Scriptures has written that "a dish-clout may serve as a type;" and the vile utterance finds too much countenance in this arbitrary handling of what is most holy. But this abuse of the Bible almost certainly follows from making types to be predictions of gospel things, foreshadowing gospel realities; and this is manifest from the citations now made.

8. Special note should be made of the difficulties which beset exegetes who, taking the common view, attempt to curb these extravagancies by laying down rules for the "judicious" application of the types. The name of these authors is legion. And no little suspicion is created as to the methods of the whole of them, in that no two of them agree, or approach agreement, in settling even the first principles by which the types, as predictions, are to be interpreted. Dr. Lange, in his "Special Introduction to Leviticus," concedes that "this part of biblical theology is greatly in need of clear exposition to free it from the confusion that attends it." Remarkable as this concession is, coming as it does after the naming of twenty-five authors on typology—all of them German—it may yet be repeated after his own is included; for his "Introduction" is anything else than lucid, and the method he adopts and pursues is really bewildering. To those twenty-six as many more may be added who have written in English. For example, so voluminous is the preliminary discussion in which Dr. Fairbairn feels impelled to engage, so recondite the principles he is required to lay down, and such are the hair-splitting distinctions he is forced to make, that, according to him, it demands the learning of a philosopher, the acumen of a metaphysician, and the discrimination of a chancellor, to



read understandingly the typical portions of the Bible ! The unwieldy apparatus is disproof of this method of interpretation.

After these authors have constructed all their cumbersome machinery for working out the prophetic gospel they ascribe to the types, they find frequent use for a certain admonitory word ; they warn us to be "judicious," and they speak of "judiciousness" as the pre-eminent qualification demanded of the interpreter of these symbols. Their praise of the "judicious" expositor is, just here, a confession that the method of interpretation in question is entirely arbitrary, and that in applying the types every man must therefore fall back on his own discretion as his chief or only guide. No such word is in place when the axe-man is directed to hew to the line, for his work is not left to his "judiciousness ;" the command implies there is a line to guide his eye and direct his strokes. But in the case before us the term concedes there is nothing outside of the interpreter's own discretion to direct or restrain him. It implies that the types are like the stones in a quarry, from which the builder is at liberty to draw and erect an edifice either fantastic and extravagant in shape, or modest and sensible. He must be a rule to himself. But what appears to be "judicious" to one man may be seen by another to be the careering of a fervid imagination. At the very best, there can only be a curbing of the play of the fancy at some undefined point where the expounder may choose to stop. Where this point is located by some we have already seen. We cannot allow that even the most obscure symbols of Scripture are left, for their explanation, to be tossed on the waves of this fluctuating sea. We must therefore reject the principle which demands it.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE DIVINE INTENT OF THE LAW OF SACRIFICE.

THE ends intended by the ritual which centered at the Jewish Altar, and the lessons actually taught by the sacrifice, are in the main so obvious that in passing over to the affirmative side of this discussion we are by no means required to take the laboring oar.

In general, then, Moses' ritual set forth certain permanent and unchangeable principles in God's dealing with His people—principles then and there in force, and easily recognized. To repeat the words of Dr. A. A. Hodge: "The principles of vicarious and peculiar suffering upon which the sacrifices of the law proceeded are identical with those upon which, by the one offering for sin, Christ forever perfected them that are sanctified." The principles are all there; but the facts of the gospel which conform to those principles, and which afterward vitalized them, are not there; nor are they spoken of by the service. The whole ritual law may be compared to a mould of definite shape, into which molten metal is to be cast. As yet that mould exhibits nothing but the exact form in which the metal is hereafter to appear. As far as the mould is concerned, this metal may be of one kind or of another. The metal—carrying out the simile—actually to be cast into this mould by the coming and the work of Christ comprises all the great facts peculiar to the gospel; and these facts must therefore be accepted by us in the exact shape given to them by

the ancient Jewish mould. They are all to be accepted after that TYPE. For example, the slaying of the victim at the altar declares the principle that sinners are deserving of death, and the further principle of a substitution of the innocent for the guilty ; but with these principles the service stops, so far as the gospel is concerned. It fixes the notion of substitution, but it does not proclaim the gospel substitute. The laver stood between the altar and the tabernacle, and those who approached to enter were required to wash. This plainly set forth the principle that polluted man must be purified before coming into the presence of a holy God. But the formula went no farther ; it gave no information of the great facts of " the gospel mystery of sanctification." So of every separate feature of that service. The whole system exhibited principles then present and ever existing, but it never predicted the future gospel facts which filled out, or fulfilled, these principles. Let us go somewhat into details :

*I. Lessons to the Individual Worshipper :*

As to the individual Israelite in his own behalf, so *speaking* was the very form of his service in presenting his offering before the Lord, that he could not well fail of receiving several great lessons which addressed his heart rather than his intellect, and which were fitted to penetrate his whole moral nature.

(a) That prescribed act of his palpably reminded him that he was a sinner, guilty before his God ; and the lifelong repetition of the act wrought this truth into his inmost soul, and made it there distinct. " In those sacrifices there was a remembrance made "—rather, a reminder—" of sins every year" (Heb. 10 : 3). Not that we need this apostolic assurance of the fact. Still less did the Israelite require any explanation of the signifi-

cant ceremonial. The leading to the altar of an innocent animal, the confession over it of his sins by the worshipper, the shedding of the victim's life blood, the very name—"a sin-offering"—given to the service, were all trumpet voices speaking forth the truth that he who did the service was a sinner every day. Indeed, the whole rite was a confession acted out by the worshipper—a confession which was the rebound of the unavoidable impression made upon him. Says Dr. A. A. Hodge : "There is not the slightest indication that the design of any sacrifice was ever to produce a moral influence on the transgressor" ("Atonement," p. 137). A more astounding statement was never made. If it were true it would be a poor commendation of the service—an act of worship that aims at no moral influence on the sinner ! The sentiment condemns itself. But what "indication" do we need ? Must we have a superscription written over the sacrifice, saying, "This is designed to impress the heart" ? As well write over the figure of the human hand with pointing finger, "This points in such a direction !" The shape of the rite was itself the very best indication of its intent ; for as the worshipper could not but be impressed, this must have been in part its design. It could never occur to any man to deny this—so amazing is the denial !—unless he was committed previously to a theory.

(b) So of a sense of ill-desert. When the Israelite stood by and witnessed the sufferings of the harmless creature pierced with the knife, when he beheld it shudder and gasp in death, he needed only to remember that this was on account of his sins, in order to be penetrated with the truth that he deserved to die, as died the victim before his sight. No homily from prophet's mouth, denouncing on him the just anger of God, could

so affect him. The service spoke feelingly to his eye—the most susceptible of the senses—and through his eye to his heart, telling him again and again what was his righteous desert and punishment.

By all judicious pastors it is recognized that solid religious character can be built up only on a genuine conviction of sin. But even in this Christian age, when a knowledge of God's rights and law, and an acquaintance with man's duty and obligations and shortcomings, would seem to be as general as the light of day, there is confessedly a great amount of superficial religion, owing to the absence of a solid basis in the consciousness of guilt. But if, in this day of knowledge, the mistake is disastrous through a failure to preach the law of God, how much more did the Jew require to have worked into him the slowly learned lesson of his ill-desert! "By the law is the knowledge of sin;" and this as really by the ceremonial as by the moral section of the law.

(c) The Israelite was made to understand that his sin was no light thing—not a thing that could at all be passed over as by the indulgence of a fond Father who would wink at the past when it was repented of. When he saw that even his ceremonial defilements needed to be expiated by blood he could not avoid the reflection that his grave moral offences much more demanded a substantial atonement. And while this atonement was not preached to him by his sacrifices, these opened for it a place wide and deep in his moral convictions. They told him he not only deserved to die, but of right must die, or have satisfaction made to justice by means of a substitute; and this he left to the grace of God to arrange as He saw fit. In this way his conscience was quickened till it created an aching void within. An apostle attests that those sacrifices, even when offered with penitence,

“could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.” Rather, the very act awoke his guilty fears, deepened and widened the painful void, and gave justice a voice calling still for blood—more blood. Dr. Geikie (“Life of Christ”), adverting to the extent of the sacrificing and the nature of that service, impressively terms it “a well-nigh revolting symbol” and “a stern and awful spectacle;” and thereupon he adds: “The men who have called the evangelical system ‘the religion of the shambles,’ in their impiety have stumbled over a great and important truth—the sternness of divine justice and the claims of God’s law against the guilty. The worshipper, awestruck, saw that sin is no trifle.” Men may, indeed, if they please, stigmatize our faith as “a harsh and bloody system,” but it was all there in its principles at the Altar.

Thus that service of sacrifice, so far from being a gospel preaching pardon through Christ for past wilful sinfulness and rebellion, became, in fact, like the rest of the law, rather “a ministration of condemnation” (2 Cor. 3 : 7, 9). So far as it was “a pointing finger” to anything beyond itself it was not so much to the cross as to the dreadful chasm between the sinner and the favor of God. This latter was its direct and palpable lesson.

(d) In the ritual of the Altar, as well as in the numerous washings (“baptisms,” Heb. 9 : 10) which were connected with it, was taught and impressed the further lesson of moral defilement, and the consequent need of spiritual purification. In our theology there is made between pardon and sanctification a wide distinction which the Jew was not taught to recognize. We separate the two so widely that, while we properly refer forgiveness to the blood of Christ, sanctification is too often considered a thing more or less aside from this. As a con-

sequence, the necessity for this mighty internal renovation very much fails to appear. But the Israelite, in his daily offering of blood, was instructed in his need of "the double cure"—pardon for the past and deliverance from the vileness of the present. Hence, those rites of expiation were commonly called "cleansings," reference being had both to the conscience and the heart. And how deeply the sense of impurity must have been grounded in the Jew we can readily suppose by observing how multiform and repeated and toilsome were the ablutions he performed. This feature of Judaism Peter characterizes as a "yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." But the very burden of it conducted, for the time then being, to secure the end for which it was ordained—the infixing upon stolid and degraded hearts the salutary lessons of guilt and pollution.

(e) Where those manifold ritual services were had, and where men thereby were made to feel they were indeed sinners, another essential lesson was taught them—that their hope of the divine favor could be only through God's mere mercy, and in no part through their own performances. This is a lesson which needed to be reiterated not only to the Jew, but which must, in every dispensation, be driven home to the heart of all men. To surrender all dependence on personal merit, and to fall back absolutely on the compassion of God, is one of the hardest of things for human nature to do. But the whole drift of that ancient ceremonial was in the face of all self-complacency and self-justification. Its every feature and requirement cut down human pride and exposed all lurkings of the spirit of boasting. It flatly confronted that consequential thing which is "an abomination to the Lord," and threw the worshipper on his face to the ground, a suppliant for pardon.

It is plain from Old Testament history and from religious experience recorded there that the mercy of Jehovah was the great plea of God's children of that day. If here and there the pious appeal to "cleanness of hands," to "uprightness of heart," and to God's righteousness, the reference is—not to the ultimate principle of divine justice, but to the Lord's covenant engagements to deal graciously with those who are obedient and sincere.

(f) The daily service of the altar was fitted to admonish the worshippers that some other and far better sacrifice was needed really and fully to expiate *sin*. This further lesson was taught by the limitations of the service and by its endless repetitions. He who did the service, although it was daily, and was multiplied on numerous stated occasions, yet departed from the sanctuary still laboring under "conscience of sins" (Heb. 10 : 2). As he who, after once washing his hands, immediately proceeds to wash them again and again, thereby betrays his dissatisfaction with any cleansing accomplished, so the unending repetition of his sacrifices sent away the Israelite—only to come again—with the impression that after all there was something unsatisfactory—that the guilt stains still reappeared. Hence it was that, to make up this troublesome deficiency, men multiplied formalities far beyond what the divine law enjoined. And when the Jewish people proceeded to the horrible work of burning human victims to expiate guilt, they only betrayed how ineradicable they felt guilt to be.

Neither could it escape any thoughtful Israelite that his wilful and deliberate violations of the ten commandments—his deeds of malice, covetousness, and lust, his perjuries and declensions into idolatry—were incomparably more guilty than all his ceremonial defilements. And when he found in the law of sacrifice no provision



whatever for these crimes of high degree, he must indeed have been troubled and made to feel that "some better sacrifices than his lambs and oxen were demanded to put away his guilt" (Heb. 9 : 23). Such was the awful conviction of David with the blood of Uriah upon his hands.

If we take the word *type* in its rigidly literal sense, as that which imprints and makes an impression, and if we look at the impression actually made—which the word *character* strictly denotes—by the typical altar service, we shall find in that a true antitype. What that imprint, that *character*, was we may learn from the utterance of the pious but erring king—"Have mercy upon me, God, according to Thy lovingkindness : according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Thou desirest not sacrifice ; else would I give it : Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit : a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise." The performance of prescribed rites, so far from being thought by David to be an effectual atonement for his sin—for *his* sin no atoning rites were prescribed—that his accustomed ritual only intensified his sense of guilt, and left him keenly dependent on the Lord's forgiveness. This was the legitimate working of the service.

In another place the royal penitent cries out, "Oh, how I love the holy law !" By this word he means the ritual no less than what we distinguish as the moral code ; and he proclaims his pleasure not only in meditating on that ritual, but in attending upon it. Doubtless with a spiritual relish David waited upon the service of the Altar, just as many a Christian attends to a powerful, searching

sermon, and for the same reason—it laid bare his heart, it revealed to him his sinfulness, it stimulated him to fly to the gracious promise that he who confesseth shall find mercy.

Such a schooling as this could not fail to become “means of grace” to many a worshipper, leading his mind and lifting his heart toward “better things,” above and beyond the direct provisions and awards of the Mosaic economy. As far indeed as a mere outward compliance was concerned, the whole round of that economy was complete within a temporal and worldly sphere. All its distinctive outgoings to the individual, in view of his outward obedience, terminated in a simple legal subjection, and in the earthly advantages promised thereto. That covenant of works did not include a regenerate heart (Jer. 31 : 31–33) ; but just as the admonishing providence of God often impels sinful men to seek and to find something better than that providence itself reveals to them, so “the law of ordinances” quickened not a few before the altar to seek and obtain blessings spiritual and eternal not included in that legal covenant. This spiritual attainment should have been general, but probably it was always rather the exception. Such an exception was the case of David. Blessed with the gift of a new heart, which Mosaism did not engage to bestow, he learned and loved to commune with God ; and being taught by his Altar service, he hoped for the pardon of crimes for which that service provided no blood ; and finding that his intimate communion with God brought him into one with a life blessed and everlasting, he rationally inferred from the very nature of this communion that he should forever enjoy—what was more than his ceremonial religion promised—an endless continuance of that blissful communion. That lofty strain,

“There is none on earth that I desire beside Thee,” rises above the economy of David’s day, and contains within itself the essence and the potency of a blessed eternity.\*

## *II. The Training of the Nation.*

While the impression of conscious guilt, of ill-desert, and need of mercy was made upon the individual, the service which effected this was, at the same time, slowly, through their generations, educating that peculiar people in the same great lessons. As Dr. Fairbairn well states it, God “placed the Church under a *course of training*, which included instruction by types.” And here was a pregnant necessity completely overlooked by our allegorizers. The sense of moral wrong and of consequent vileness was not only lost from the ancient world, but the very idea of moral purity was effaced from the human soul. When Moses appeared mankind had become so degraded by corrupt social manners, and especially by horrid and obscene usages of idol worship, that the distinction between moral right and wrong was lost and forgotten. How could it have been otherwise, when deeds the most murderous and licentious were sanctioned and exalted by that which should have been most pure, and also the noblest purifier, on earth—namely, the religion of mankind? Witness the worship of Baal, the offerings to Moloch, the rites of Ashtaroath, the services of Thammuz. The *idea* and the knowledge of purity, humanity, justice, and right had to be revived on earth anew. The lost thought of holiness needed to be created afresh in the human understanding. The magnitude of this

---

\* In that valuable work of Dr. Oehler, “Theology of the Old Testament,” this topic is presented in a very forcible manner. By the way, this evangelical author does not seem to find any preaching of Christ in the altar service.

thought needed to be engraved on that tablet within, which had long been filled with shocking imagery. Hence the distinction between clean and unclean, which, in Moses' law, was so far carried out and ramified, touching meats and drinks, and utensils and persons. All discourse and mere verbal explanation were in vain when the world had sunk to its lowest and worst estate. Nay, human language itself had become so prostituted and debased as no longer to be a vehicle for holy thoughts. The words which at first denoted *sweet* came to designate what was really bitter ; and the words which had meant *bitter* were applied to what was really sweet. What perversion and obliteration of all right moral ideas were indeed not to be expected when even the deities after whom men thought it meritorious to pattern were monsters of cruelty, injustice, and lust !

Owing to this blotting out of the idea and even the names of holiness, the very diseases of the human frame had to be employed to contribute to the revival of what was lost. They were placed under priestly treatment. The religious and curative were blended in one, to drill into besotted souls the thought of moral disorder, and to make palpable man's need of a spiritual cure. To renew and vivify thoughts and desires akin to God, men were necessarily managed as the deaf and dumb are now treated—taught the language of signs, and then taught to associate with those signs ideas which were foreign to the mind before. This discipline it was needful to begin low down ; it must needs be slow ; and it required centuries to accomplish its work. Corresponding to the growth of the individual under education is the growth of the race—"slow as are the ages."

It will be allowed that when thoughts of God's spirituality and holiness are wanting, and where the whole

current of the soul flows on in darkness, without the suspicion of even the existence of such a thing as light, the presentation of any truth distinctive of the gospel is quite in vain. As well direct the attention of men stone blind to the colors of the rainbow. "The whole have no need of a physician." Let us look even at our own times. Many a modern preacher would be better employed if, instead of forcing the gospel into Jewish cleansings by blood, he enforced upon his hearers the true doctrine of those cleansings; for even at this late day, after the divine religion of Moses has fulfilled its mission, and when a knowledge of sin is supposed to be co-extensive with Christendom, many a proclamation of Christ is thrown away because the need of Christ was not first shown in men's guilt and vileness before their God. Instead of wasting their breath in explaining that Christ was preached to Israel at the Altar, it behooves ministers to preach Moses to their own hearers. The law exhibited, Christ will be more appreciated by them.

But what of Israel when their Messiah appeared? If, at the close of the Jewish period, that people were not as conscience-stricken and ripe for the gospel as they should have been, this is not proof that anything looking in that direction was wanting in their divine religion; rather, it was proof that they were a race singularly stiff-necked and adequate to the perversion of any form or degree of religious truth God might commit to them.

Yet the lessons of Moses were far from being lost on that people. When the hope of Israel came they were in many respects ready for the divine manifestation. All the preparatory work had been done, and well done. As the happy result, multitudes of them, including "a great company of the priests, became obedient to the faith" (Acts 6 : 7). And it is most worthy of remark

that among the dispersed Jews the proportion of converts to the new religion was probably far greater than it was at home in Judea. In Jerusalem, and all around, there were powerful local influences that repressed the work. From those unhappy restraints the Jews of the dispersion were comparatively free. The numerous converts abroad would become the connecting link with the whole Gentile Church. Nor is it at all likely that the gospel would have taken root among the pagans if it had not first been embraced by very many of the Jews, their fellow-townsmen and neighbors. The truth of this is emphasized by the prophet : " I will sow her into me in the earth, and I will call *them* my people which were not my people " (Hos. 2 : 23). And here, no doubt, is seen the divine intent in that wide and numerous " sowing " of the Jewish people through all the Roman Empire. In city and town they were everywhere in sufficient numbers to provoke a popular hostility. But they became everywhere the germs and nuclei of the churches of the Gentile world.

But could we suppose it possible for the gospel to have been preached with any success even in the Jewish nation without the long Mosaic training they had received ? The proclamation of the new religion to the pagan world must have proved a signal failure, without that previously trained Jewish element dispersed among the Gentiles. Aside from those Mosaic ideas and moral convictions by which the " peculiar people " were lifted up, the gulf would appear to have been too wide to be bridged over to the outside world. So far as we can see, that ceremonial drilling was necessary to span the chasm and open a passage for the gospel to the nations abroad. The leaven of true religious principles having been long before generated among the Jewish people, they more

or less imbued and elevated the pagans who came most in contact with them. So far as these became the subjects of converting grace, their brethren, the converted Jews, would lift them and brace them up in all the great principles underlying the gospel. By this all-wise method, "the olive-tree wild by nature was, contrary to nature, grafted into the good olive-tree" (Rom. 11 : 24). And this grafting of a worse people into the religious communion of a far better is a general law of the growth of the kingdom. May not the shocking moral obliquities which disgraced the Corinthian Church have been owing in part to a lack of a sufficient amount of the converted Jewish element among them? However this may have been, it is apparent that the work of conversion among the Jews went forward extensively in all lands until the Gentiles began to press into the kingdom. But, as has been noted by a late writer, no sooner had these largely come in than conversions of Israelites became rare, until at length there were almost none. Thus, in the providence of God, Jewish jealousy at the coming in of the heathen had no occasion to rise and throw them off until the divine purpose respecting the Gentiles was fairly realized.

Aside from these facts, it will be conceded that when Christ and His apostles went forth to preach to their countrymen they had no occasion to go so far back as to indoctrinate them in the fundamental ideas of sin, guilt, and deserved punishment. All these ideas had among them a fixed home. Neither had the preachers of the new dispensation the least call to instruct the Jews touching the principles of expiation, atonement, and the vindication of divine justice by the substitution of the innocent for the guilty. In all this the law had been an efficient "schoolmaster to bring them to Christ." If

most of them refused the Messiah, it was not because they stumbled at the Bible doctrine of sin and vicarious sacrifice. It was rather because, through their self-righteousness, they failed to see the application of those doctrines to themselves. They were offended also at the lowly person of Jesus of Nazareth, and they refused to see that the Messiah was to be "cut off, but not for Himself."

Can as much be said for modern Unitarians, rationalists, and naturalists, who condemn the religion of Moses, and consistently with this deny the reality of sin and the demands of justice, and mock at anything like atonement? Says Mr. Ballou, a leader among them: "Sin is a necessary and indirect way to the highest excellence!" Say others: "Sin is simply the violation of natural law, like stumbling over a stone; and for it there is neither atonement nor forgiveness any more than for accidentally scalding one's self!" Would that these large and gospel-annulling classes could be put through the school of Moses! That training, though it might not even whisper to them of Christ, would wonderfully change their attitude toward Him and His work. As vigorous open-air exercise whets the appetite for wholesome food, as thorough experience in the school of adversity gives zest to a subsequent life of solid comfort, that drilling before the Altar would make their acceptance of the Lord Jesus as their "all and in all," when He should be offered to them, vastly more likely than at present.

Wherein consisted "the fulness of the times" at which Christ is said to have come? Did it consist in the mere lapse of the ages? Was it realized in a supposed "failure of Judaism"? That fulness asserted itself by an apostle, was found mainly in the readiness of the Jewish people to be graduated, like a college class, from their preparatory school, and advance to the feet of the



teachers of the new religion. The nation had been sufficiently exercised in the doctrine of one true God, holy, just, and merciful, of the dread nature of sin and its defilement, the need of forgiveness, and the need of atonement in order to pardon and cleansing. In this stupendous work we find occasion for the law of sacrifice and purification, without dragging in a preaching of the Gospel before the Church was ripe for it. "The heir, as long as he is a child, is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father" (Gal. 4 : 1, 2), and only then does he come into possession of the estate which he was unfit to appreciate and use before.

### *III. Mosaism a Yoke needfully made Weighty.*

Looking to the same end—the preparatory training of Israel—was the vast multiplicity of details in the Mosaic service, and also the precision of form in which all these details were enjoined. Aside from this end, nothing is more perplexing to the sober Bible reader than this great multiplicity and precision. Mr. Southey looked upon the Book of Leviticus as "a sealed mystery." Yet it is just the amplitude of this field that affords to the allegorizer free scope for his fancy. Starting out with the persuasion that this complex ritual, as a whole, preaches Christ, he must arbitrarily hang gospel fruit upon every branch and twig of the wide-spreading tree. Every priestly touch, turn, and movement must mean that or it means nothing.

But "in order to see the design of the many items in this system, the inquiry ought not to be, What do *we* need, and what impression are they adapted to make on *our* minds? but What did *Israel* require, and what impression would they make upon the Jews then existing?"\*

---

\* Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation, by Dr. J. B. Walker—a little book having more to the point than many bulky commentaries.

Particularity in the multitude of little things is a characteristic of the Oriental mind. While God in His wisdom would accommodate the service to this particularity, He at the same time reached several important results.

(a) The people of Israel, being children in understanding, and of very wayward heart, could not safely be left at liberty to shape the performance of their rites as they might see fit. Men of sobriety and mature judgment, in receiving commands, may be trusted to fill up details according to their discretion. Hence in the Christian Church the directions for public worship are of the most general kind : "Let all things be done decently and in order." What that order shall be is left to Christian wisdom. But instructions given to children must be very minute, leaving no room for childish caprice, else they will fall into what is unseemly and hurtful. For this reason, if Israel was to have a religious ritual at all, it was needful that it should be prescribed to them in all its parts.

(b) The large multiplicity of Jewish ordinances, as well as the particularity of shape to which these were restricted, was doubtless a much-needed hedge to keep out idolatrous usages. Israel was prone to idolatry. Their situation in the midst of gross idolatrous nations constantly exposed them to this, their besetting sin. Now we learn "the law was added because of transgressions," and we may suppose chiefly because of this capital offence against God. And although we now may not be able to see it, there is no reason to doubt that to very many of the Mosaic precepts a shape was given the reverse of idolatrous rites, and for the express end of guarding the people from those abominations. To make the gulf between them and idolaters impassable, if this could be done, it was even enjoined upon them not to

cut and round their beards after the heathen fashion. Inasmuch, then, as they had their hands full of these antagonistic forms, from the beginning to the end of their lives, the greatest possible barrier was thrown up between the chosen people and the devotees of Baal and Moloch.

(c) This long array of definitely prescribed rites tendered powerfully to drill in the spirit of obedience. The services being so numerous and so fixed, and the people remaining much in the dark as to the full outgoing of them, their performance would severely test and also confirm the temper of subjection, if there was a spark of this in the heart. In fact, to comply implicitly and continuously in those circumstances would imply a spirit of obedience well-nigh passive. By this regimen the Jewish nation learned what is declared of the individual man—that “it is good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth.” This certainly was a training that Israel greatly needed, for they were emphatically “a rebellious people.”

(d) That constant round of formal services—many of them involving cost and great toil—would make any people feel the religious burden laid upon them. That Israel felt it and groaned under it we have apostolic testimony. Paul calls it a “yoke of bondage;” and Peter, as we have seen, pronounced it “a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.” But the bearing of a yoke always teaches a people to appreciate liberty, and it should teach them to make a proper use of liberty when it comes. The slavery of Egypt, needful in its severity, properly went before the miraculous emancipation of the sons of Jacob; and it was a part of the wise economy of God with that people, looking to their subsequent elevation and religious improvement. In the same category with that servitude we may place

the burden of the Jewish law of ordinances. It was designed to inspire a sigh for "the liberty wherewith Christ makes His people free," and to prepare the nation to "stand fast" in that liberty, by faith in their own Messiah.

(e) Above all, the grossness of their hearts and the estrangement of their minds from the very idea of holiness, justice, and truth made this varied and endless reiteration a necessary training for Israel. Their many and deplorable lapses into vile immoralities and stupid idolatry, especially in the earlier period of their pupilage, betray what they were and what they needed. Children must receive many lessons, and these must be very often repeated. "It must be line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little." And even this busy and impressive round of religious rites was not carried home to the national heart of Israel without repeated and severe visitations of divine Providence. The idolatrous nations around, from whose abominations the Mosaic rites were in part intended to protect God's people, became the scourge to enforce the ritual of the Altar. This scourging inflicted by idolaters would naturally make them averse to everything peculiar to their enemies, and most of all to their religious usages.

Illustrative of the divine wisdom in laying upon Israel this heavy yoke, and akin to it, is that providential economy—also wise—by which a corrupt and vicious people are, by their vices, made poor, and are kept in that condition. Their poverty makes them weak; and being thus made helpless, they are less capable of the mischief which the vicious are always ready to inflict on themselves and on others. Their poverty also keeps them more fully employed in order to obtain the mere necessities of life; and being thus tied fast to daily toil,

they have less liberty to spend their little strength in further corrupting themselves and everything they can reach. The confessed deterioration of the soil in the land of Israel—a country certainly rich in Moses' day—was more owing to the vices of that people than to any other natural cause whatever. It was well that this exhaustion of the soil confronted the people in their frequent downward career of sin. "Fulness of bread and abundance of idleness" were the twofold snare of Sodom, and so she became the embodiment of moral vileness. Very mercifully did the God of Israel mark for that people a very narrow path, and hedge it with thorns on either side.

#### *IV. The Sin-Offerings were real Atonements.*

While the Altar ritual was doing its appropriate work for the heart of the individual worshipper and for the nation in its generations, those sacrifices did, at the same time, actually atone for certain large classes of offences.

These offences included "sins of ignorance," as when a man inadvertently touched an unclean thing, or inconsiderately bound himself with an oath. The law also extended to certain moral wrongs, as when a person injured his neighbor by lying, touching found goods, or by being guilty of a breach of trust (Lev. 6 : 1-7); also when like offences were committed by the whole congregation "sinning through ignorance" (Lev. 4 : 13). And as the people were always imperfect in their obedience in all such matters, yearly and monthly, and even daily atonements were stated, ever-recurring acts of worship.

That these atonements were real, in and of themselves accomplishing all the ends of expiation, is plain from the oft-repeated words: "And the priest shall make atonement for him, and his sins shall be forgiven him." This

would be the natural force of the terms with any Bible reader who had no theory to sustain. But as for the Israelite, he could have no doubt about it; no other thought would enter his mind. As to this there is probably no dissentient opinion.

But this atoning work was effectual in only one particular relation of a temporal kind. It did not avail for *sin* against God as the Ruler of all worlds, and as meriting the death of the soul in the future state. It fell utterly short of being an efficient factor in God's unchangeable moral government over men. For blood to speak with effect there it must be far more precious than that offered by Abel or shed on Jewish altars.

In pursuance of the gracious design in making Israel His "special treasure," the Lord was pleased to enter personally into peculiar relations with that people—to become, we may say, their national sovereign. It was for this reason they were forbidden to set up a king, after the custom of other nations (1 Sam. 8 : 7). Nor can we otherwise understand how their act of choosing Saul was a rejection of the Lord. Thus only can we see reason for the solemnity of the injunction forbidding them this step. Hence their act is classed with all their deeds "whereby they forsook Jehovah and served other gods" (1 Sam. 8 : 8). With propriety, therefore, the civil and local government of Israel has been called a theocracy. God Himself gave them their civil and criminal code. He favored them with the visible manifestations of His presence. And after they, in the face of the original constitution, thrust Saul upon a throne, the Lord still claimed to be their king in a sense special to them as a nation; and this claim He made good by designating the man who should act as His vicegerent, "putting down one and setting up another." And in

this special relation He continued, through all their history, to administer His own laws and to enforce them by the sanctions which He ordained in that theocratic administration. These sanctions, be it observed, were limited to time and this present world. If Israel remained obedient, the nation was to continue in their goodly land. The blessings of life, growth, and prosperity were to be realized by each and every pious family of all their tribes. And every individual Jew who adhered in loyalty to Jehovah, the nation's King, was promised his share in these national and social blessings. But if, on the other hand, the people "refused and rebelled," all manner of temporal calamities would overtake them.

This system did not, therefore, reach to and include the great awards of God's universal moral government over men and angels—the life everlasting in His presence, and the endless death of the soul beyond the grave. These final retributions are from the high throne of the universe, and one or the other of them is to be the recompense of every individual man, be he Jew or Gentile, "according to the deeds done in the body."

It was, then, in that narrower and temporary relation of the Jewish people to their King that their sacrificial atonement availed. Where, in other countries, stripes and fines were imposed, or the death penalty was inflicted, these expiations were ordained in Israel, and they actually satisfied the principles of divine justice within the sphere contemplated. "That is," says Dr. Hodge ("Atonement," p. 139), "the ceremonial (?) penalty was remitted, *ipso facto*, upon the completion of a regular sacrifice."

As a result of these expiations, the offending parties were reinstated in the privileges they had forfeited—es-

pecially life in the land which the Lord had promised to their fathers. But if these rites of "reconciliation" were neglected, the guilty were exposed to the severe penalties which the law denounced on all despisers of the theocratic authority. Thus (Ex. 12 : 15) : "Whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." Some judgment would cut short his days. If it be deemed unreasonably harsh that a man should suffer loss of life because of some ceremonial mishap or neglected cleansing of the person, two words of reply may be dropped : *First*, while the act in itself may have been unimportant, the wilfulness that refused the easy purification was a most guilty thing. *Secondly*, the neglected cleansing may only have furnished due *occasion* for taking away a life already forfeited by sin.

We may discern the divine wisdom in the economy of atonement now examined. While the service furthered all the personal and general advantages already explained—advantages comprised within the Lord's covenant with Israel in Canaan—this interlinking of the criminal code with the religious practice made it conduce to all the high providential ends for which that people had been there set apart. Their very slips, mistakes, and careless omissions were made the occasion of establishing the necessary and unchangeable principles on which the gospel ever proceeds. The idea of atonement, as a thing absolutely necessary, was more fully grounded in the Jewish mind. Since this atonement was effected by the substitution of life for life, and not by any extra deeds of moral worth by which the offender might hope to meet a past deficiency, he was admonished that he reached the divine favor on no basis of personal excellence or merit ; he found no room for boasting and self-satisfaction ; he



was withdrawn from himself by having his eye turned to the valuable life that went instead of his own. And inasmuch as the very best offerings the Israelite was able to present covered only his smaller faults, the lesson sunk more deeply into his heart that his more grievous sins were not yet expiated, though they more imperatively demanded expiation than his ceremonial defilements. Thus would conscience clamor for "better blood" than he had presented.

## CHAPTER X.

### RELATION OF THE WHOLE ECONOMY OF THE ALTAR TO GOSPEL TRUTH AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

1. FOR us the very highest value attaches to the *Mosaic record* of the law of Jewish sacrifice and the explanations that attend it, and also to the *history* of its working among that people ; and this value is enduring and co-extensive with the Christian religion. There are those indeed who tell us that most parts of the Old Testament, including especially the portions relating to the Jewish ceremonial, may be dismissed by the Christian Church as “ containing dead issues with which men now living have nothing to do.” Over against this it may be affirmed that those very portions of the Hebrew Scriptures which these men esteem of least importance are of the highest value of all. As for those other matters which some consider the only remaining grains of gold in the Old Testament—the account of creation, the origin and unity of the human race, and the moral code of Sinai—they are valuable indeed, but there is nothing of salvation in them, and the substance of them all may be found in the New Testament. But the law of the Altar can be fairly read only in the books of Moses. And a knowledge of the drift and spirit of that law is absolutely fundamental to a true understanding of the gospel and a correct apprehension of the work of Christ. However far a student may advance in reading books of science and philosophy, he must still keep in mind the alphabet

in which those books are written, and he must retain every word as he at first learned to define it. The services of the Altar are to the death of Christ what the axioms and definitions of geometry are to all the demonstrations of this science. To reject and ignore those mathematical principles on the plea that the student has advanced beyond them were no more unsafe and absurd than to repudiate the books of the Levitical service while reaching forward to a true knowledge of salvation through Christ. If the gospel edifice is to rise and stand secure, it must rest upon the foundation principles laid for it in the Mosaic ritual. To stop short of this truth is to impugn the wisdom of the whole Jewish economy. It makes the calling of Israel and their separate training of more than a thousand years to be unreasonable things of naught.

2. Here is the gist of our whole discussion. In this one point the entire argument of the present tract converges, and it is a point of supreme and everlasting importance to the Christian world. The laws and history of the Mosaic ritual of the Altar present most necessary data to guide the Christian Church in determining the New Testament doctrine of the cross. And it was mainly to fix and furnish these data to us that the Jewish race was made "a peculiar people" and the Levitical Altar set up.

The religious inquirer, following the example of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8), reads respecting the Messiah that God "made to meet in Him the iniquities of us all." In the Christian Scriptures we learn that Jesus "gave His life a ransom for many;" that "He who knew no sin was made sin for us;" that "He died the just for the unjust;" that He "bore our sins in His own body on the tree;" that "through Him we have received the atonement;" that "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed

for us ;” that He is “ our peace” with God. The whole contexture of the gospels and epistles, wherever the intent of the death of Christ is spoken of, is written, so to speak, in the alphabetical forms of the Jewish ritual. It is all summed up in that emphatic utterance of John the Baptist : “ Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.”

*How are we to understand this reiterated language ?* There is but one key to the understanding of it, and common honesty requires us to use that key, and to use it fairly. We here find the Old Testament phraseology of the Altar carried over into the New Testament and made the staple of the language setting forth the necessity and meaning of the death of Christ. We again and again meet here the sacrificial ideas in which the Jew was trained, and the import of which he well apprehended. To perceive the full force of our inquiry, let us recollect that for a long period before the birth of Christ, and for a century after that event, the Hellenists—those Jews dispersed through all Greek-speaking lands—had in common use that version of the Old Testament called the Septuagint. This same version is generally followed by the New Testament writers when citing from the Jewish Scriptures. Now these writers, when treating of the intent of the death of Christ, employ substantially the very same words which, in the Septuagint of the Mosaic books, are used when speaking of the sacrifices of the altar. Thus, as the term represented by *propitiation*, compare 1 John 2 : 2 and 4 : 10 with the Septuagint of Leviticus 1 : 4 and 4 : 20. Touching the word rendered *propitiatory* or *mercy-seat*, compare Rom. 3 : 25 with Lev. 16 : 13, 14, 15. With regard to the word rendered *ransom*, compare Matt. 2 : 28, Acts 7 : 35, and Luke 1 : 68, with Lev. 25 : 48, 51, and Ps. 19 : 15.

How would the Greek-speaking Jew understand these old familiar words when uttered by the apostles of the cross? How alone could he understand them? To the Jew the gospel was first preached. In the preaching of Christ to him he hears anew his well-known doctrine of atonement, and often in his own familiar words, though now in a fresh and wonderful connection. And he hears it without a word of apostolic caution warning him not to take it too literally. He is never admonished that, when he hears this Altar phraseology applied to Jesus on the cross, he must receive it in a sense "highly figurative." Having his mind imbued with the doctrine of literal atonements, and his heart impressed with the necessity of these cleansings by blood, this new application of old terms would necessarily conduct him, as if taken by the hand, to the conclusion that the blood of Christ was strictly an expiation for guilt, and that the cross was truly the Altar on which the sacrifice was laid. If the apostolic teaching had been cunningly devised to deceive men into this belief, it could not well have been put in words better fitted to accomplish that end. As *the Jew* would naturally understand the words, such is their real import, and so must we receive them.

But, as if to lift this great question entirely out of the arena of controversy, we have a remarkable presentation of the subject in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, and especially in chapters 8, 9, and 10, we find an extended discussion of the several relations between the temporary redemption of Moses' system and the "eternal redemption" wrought out by Christ. In a labored analysis the several parts of both are taken up singly, and the strictly analogical relation between the two is firmly established. The priesthood of Christ is set over against that of the sons of Levi. The "one offering" of Christ

is placed in contrast with the continual offerings of Levi's sons. The unlimited efficacy of the blood of the cross is contrasted with the very limited efficacy of the Levitical sacrifices. The everlasting priesthood of our Lord is made antithetical with the condition of the Jewish priesthood, as changeable "by reason of death." The intercession of our Redeemer before the throne of "the heavenly grace" takes the place of the presence of the Jewish high-priest within the vail of the earthly temple.

But what is the pertinence of this extended comparison? This is shown by the sacred writer himself. *As* Aaron was the priest of the Jewish system, *so* Christ is the priest of the Christian Church. *As* Aaron presented the blood of the sin-offering, *so* Jesus presented His "own blood" (Heb. 9 : 12 and 13 : 12). *As* the blood which Aaron presented cleansed from ceremonial defilement, *so* the blood of Christ "cleanseth from all sin." *As* the congregation of Israel depended for intercession upon the victim's blood within the vail, *so* the Christian Church is to look to her veritable high priest for intercession when He appears for us before the throne of God. And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews actually holds the relations between the Jewish and the Christian systems of atonement to be so real and unfigurative that he argues that the bringing in of the new positively expelled the old and annulled it. So exactly did the two correspond in the correlated parts of each, it was not consistent that both should remain together. The old, if allowed to continue along with the new, would impinge upon it, and be in conflict with it. The positive must annul the negative.

Now, what does this entire line of inspired argumentation constantly suppose and teach? It certainly teaches that Christ was a priest at least as really as was Aaron ;

that the offering of His body on the tree was no less, if no more, truly and strictly vicarious for sin than was Aaron's burnt-offering for ceremonial guilt; that by the interceding blood of our Mediator, and by that alone, God is as truly reconciled to repentant sinners as Jehovah was made propitious by Aaron's "blood of reconciliation;" in short, that as slain beasts actually atoned for certain offences "for the time then present," so the death of Christ "put away" the sins of His people forevermore. To allow less than this is to suppose that the whole extended argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews is gravely built upon a mere *figurative* resemblance between the self-sacrifice of Christ and the victims on the Jewish altar. But to argue thus from a figure is confessedly a superficial trifling, and a most misleading kind of sophistry. To argue thus with converts once trained at the altar and imbued with its ritual would have been no other than reckless falsehood.

Will men, discoursing of the sufferings of Calvary, still persist in talking of tropes and figures of speech? Will they continue to resolve all New Testament language on this stupendous theme into "the bold metaphors of Oriental people"? Will they assert that the death of Christ was an offering for sin "only in that general sense in which the sufferings of good men redound to the benefit of others"? This might possibly be accepted if the words of the New Testament went forth alone into the world, and if the record of Jewish sacrifices were blotted out and forgotten. But the volume containing the great facts of a Saviour's death is accompanied by an authoritative key—the divine record of the law and practice of the Jewish Altar; and the Christian Scriptures continually refer back to that record as containing the principles upon which the facts of gospel salvation are

built, and according to which they must be received. A discourse in classic English must not be interpreted otherwise than by an appeal to a standard dictionary of the language ; and any treatment of gospel facts which does violence to the impress made by the Mosaic ritual is false to the truth of God and damaging to the high interests of salvation. It is precisely in this violence we discern the failure to read in the type the real truth of the antitype. "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." How indeed can it ? If gospel facts must be shaped in those Mosaic moulds, the casting away of the moulds is an end to the asserted facts of gospel redemption.

It is this vital aspect of our subject, and this aspect alone, that makes it of supreme importance that the ritual of Moses be kept evermore before the eyes of the Christian Church. But that view of the typical sacrifices which makes them to be predictions of Christ has none of this importance for us. If in the New Testament we have the certified facts of redemption, we can well dispense with the Book of Leviticus, supposing this latter is to be understood as simply adumbrating those facts. If the sun is up, we need not appeal to the previous dawn in proof that he is risen. We see him.

But viewing the sacrifices of Moses as typical in the sense of containing and enforcing all the great principles underlying the gospel salvation, the record of those principles can never be safely left out of sight. If a man whose business it is to read accurately in the English tongue has possibly forgotten many letters in the English alphabet, or if he reads on in defiance of the force and import of those letters, he cannot too soon stop his reading and go back and "learn his letters" over again.



There are men in the pulpit who curtly tell us they are "ministers of the New Testament, that with the Old they have nothing to do, and that the rites of Moses were repealed long ago." This kind of discourse may be very telling before a promiscuous congregation, but it is mischievously reckless and untrue. The builder of a house, when engaged in work upon the floors and roof, may in a certain sense say he has nothing to do with the foundation—*i. e.*, that he is not now at work upon this. But yet he *has* to do with it. Every stick and stone he lays above rests on the foundation, and his work as a whole must take shape according to the line and run of the walls beneath. The minister of the New Testament need not, it may be, very often refer directly to the rites of Moses, and less frequently need he preach sermons upon those rites. But every gospel sermon he preaches must build on the principles therein set forth. The counsellor-at-law, in his investigations and his advice to his clients, deals far more with the statute law than with the constitution of the State. Of this latter he may seldom speak. Yet this in fact underlies his whole legal practice; nor can he for a moment ignore one single provision of the *Magna Charta* of the commonwealth. In the "advanced" religious thinking of our day, let the ceremonial of Moses be dropped from our Bibles and forgotten by our religious teachers, and what must follow? As a ship which breaks from her moorings in a driving storm that sets toward a lee shore, so must our churches rapidly drift away from evangelical doctrine, and be wrecked on the shoals of unbelief.

In the science of algebra there is often given a formula according to which a problem is to be worked out. This formula is to be filled with such quantities as the occasion supplies; and they may be immensely greater than the

constructor of the formula ever imagined. But the insertion of those quantities being made, the solution must proceed strictly in accordance with the conditions which the formula presents, and with full regard to every *sign* it contains. This is the type to which the solving of the problem—as the antitype—must conform. It is thus that the *truly* typical character of the Altar accomplishes an all-important end—an end subserved by the present interpretation alone. Those offerings being again and again called types, in the sense of being forms and historical facts to which the great sacrifice of the cross is declared to be strictly analogous, we are put under inviolable bonds to read the doctrine of this sacrifice in the light of that divine analogy.

But if that system was simply a foretokening sign, like a pointing finger, then it could do nothing but point to and foreshow some fact then future. It could fix only the certainty of its coming. A finger-board pointing the way to a city can decide nothing touching the wealth or character of that city. The inward meaning, the reality, the outlook of the atonement, are all left to be determined as best they may. The consistent logic of that close thinker, Dr. C. Hodge, leads even him somewhat into this mistake. In making the point that gospel ministers are not priests, he assumes that neither were Aaron and his sons really priests, “but only symbols and types of the true priesthood of Christ.” “If the Old Testament priests were not really priests, except typically, much less are ministers of the gospel” (“Theology,” vol. 2, p. 466). Concede this of the Aaronic line and office, and we must allow that entire system to have been merely a foreshadowing picture, and then the whole sacerdotal doctrine of the cross is left to rest upon a shadow !

It is just here ample room is given to Unitarians and all rationalists to step in and deny the reality of Christ's propitiation ; and they have not been slow to seize on their advantage. And as for many advocates of the orthodox faith, at this same spot they let slip by far their best weapon of defence. Failing to see the heaven-ordained analogy between the ritual law and the gospel, or unable to appreciate its divine intent, they surrender to the enemy their chief stronghold. What they gain instead by viewing Moses as "darkly foreshadowing" the cross is a slight advantage indeed—an advantage we do not need in the presence of the clear predictions of Isaiah and the Psalmist.

Following logically from the ground yielded up to Unitarians by the common understanding of the types, is their advance to a depreciation, or an entire casting away, of the Old Testament. They forcibly reason thus : "As the Aaronic ritual was given to Israel to be to them a dim forecasting of the gospel, we can now, since the gospel has come, well afford to dispense with the whole record containing that ritual. As the sun has risen, let the taper light be cast away and forgotten." In this same line of argument the Old Testament is called "a thing of the past." It is decried as containing only "dead issues;" it is "obsolete." Thus multitudes called Christians practically ignore the volume.

If the fundamental doctrine of the gospel is to stand firm, we must hold fast the mould in which that doctrine is divinely cast ; we must recognize the real analogy between the lamb on the Jewish Altar and "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Let us hear what is substantially the voice of God to us in His work of framing the two correlated economies. In substance His voice is this : As the Jewish victim on the

altar was, in the strictest sense, an atonement for certain misdemeanors, so therefore is the victim of Calvary a strict satisfaction to justice for the sins of the world.

Let us, in the light of Scripture, examine this analogy somewhat in detail. Were the men of the Aaronic line really and truly priests, actually meditating between God and the people? So it is plainly and frequently affirmed, and so the people must surely have regarded them (Ex. 40 : 15 ; Numb. 16 : 46, 47). Then Christ was at least equally a priest in this literal sense, and as such He truly mediated between God and men on account of sin. In the Epistle to the Hebrews He is again and again so called, and this in a close argument where He is compared and contrasted with Aaron's sons, and consequently spoken of in such a way as to exclude the possibility of metaphor or figurative allusion (Heb. 2 : 11 ; 3 : 1 ; 5 : 5 ; 9 : 11).

Did the Jewish priest necessarily have something of worth to offer in making expiation? He always did, and in an expiatory sense just as real as he was himself really a priest (Lev. 9 : 7 ; 16 : 6, 11). In the case of Christ as a priest, this is made a point in the argument as a necessary thing : "It is of necessity that this man also have somewhat to offer" (Heb. 8 : 3 ; 10 : 5 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 18, 19).

Did those propitiatory sacrifices of the Levitical priesthood, called offerings for sin, always consist of living victims, and was their life's blood the essential thing before the altar? This was the very substance of the sacrifice, and because "the blood is the life" (Lev. 1 : 5). And the injunction forbidding the eating of blood was based on the principles that the blood—*i. e.*, the life—was a devoted thing, *the* thing making atonement for the sin of the soul (Lev. 17 : 10, 11). Over against this, and as

holding a corresponding place in gospel redemption, the blood of Christ is set forth in the New Testament (Acts 20 : 28). Neither are we at liberty to make the gospel language a mere figurative allusion to the bloody offerings of Moses. In words of close argumentation a Saviour's blood is made the strict counterpart to that of goats and calves (Heb. 9 : 12). And because the blood of slain beasts was effectual for certain minor ends of expiation, it is argued that the blood of Christ must be effectual in a far higher sense and in a far wider sphere (Heb. 9 : 13, 14). And just because "almost all things were by the law purged with blood," it is contended by the inspired writer that the antitype to these—namely, the heavenly things—must necessarily "be purified with better sacrifices than these" (Heb. 9 : 24). It cannot well be denied that the frequent ascription of redemption to the blood of Christ is based squarely on this literal correspondence between the new covenant and the old, both being in the same way sealed with blood. Was the sin-offering presented to God direct, and was its Godward aspect the chief outgoing of that service? So it is written, and so must the worshippers have understood it. It was worship; it was brought to the altar; it was "unto the Lord" (Lev. 1 : 3-5). In like manner, and because of "the correspondence of relations," the blood of Christ looks equally in the same direction, and because of sin. It was mainly an offering to God, and not "an appeal to the heart of man" (Heb. 9 : 11-14). Hence that view of the atonement which makes it wholly or chiefly a mere exhibition before the world of God's hatred of sin will not bear the light of Moses' law. And just as little will that interpretation of Calvary which turns it into a simple attestation of the love of God. Divine love here indeed shines like the sun; but it does so the more intensely,

just because the Godward aspect of the cross is the true one. "Herein is love, that God gave His Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins" (1 John 4 : 10).

Was the sin-offering literally a substitute of the innocent in the place of the guilty? No reader of the law can doubt it. Then the person of Christ on the tree was no less a substitute under the broken law for sinners; and so the New Testament writers would have their earliest readers, largely Jews, to understand them. "He was made sin for us" (2 Cor. 5 : 21). He died "the just for the unjust" (1 Pet. 3 : 18). In this legal sense He is "our peace" (Eph. 2 : 14). As "the life is in the blood," and as the blood of the Mosaic victim was shed before the Altar, so Jesus in this strict sense gave His life for the life of His people (Eph. 1 : 7 ; 2 : 13).

Did the offerings for sin meet something in the divine mind which needed to be propitiated, and was Israel's King in some real sense "reconciled" by its presentation? So runs the law, and to deny it is to say the Israelite was mocked by the lessons he received before the Altar. Over and over again it was echoed in his ears : "He shall make reconciliation for sins." Then the death of Christ our Lord effected really and in truth a like thing in a far higher sphere, and in more lasting relations. If the language of the New Testament is not intended to delude, His blood makes an appeal to that in the divine nature which, because of sin, needed to be satisfied; and it was offered chiefly to secure with God what is properly called *satisfaction*.

There is a view of the atonement according to which the necessity for the death of Christ is not to be sought in any attribute of the divine nature, but in an impersonal thing called public justice. The governmental theory, as this is called, does not meet the requirement

of the typical patterns furnished by the God of Israel. Those primordial moulds, after whose form all gospel truth is to be shaped, makes the demand for atonement to be personal with God. They teach that expiation was made that "He might *be* just," and not simply that He *appear* so.

We are not concerned about the flippant and threadbare utterance that "inasmuch as God Himself, through the outgoing of His infinite love, is the prime mover in the work of redemption, it cannot be, therefore, that He needed to be appeased and made gracious." Over against all such speculating, and high above it, we place the law of the typical sacrifice. Surely in the chief feature and intent of this, "the antitype must conform to the type." Not but that the above objection may be readily answered on the grounds of reason. We can easily conceive of love creating occasion to open the door, that it may go forth and express itself. It is not a thing unheard of for a father to take steps to protect his own truth, honor, and paternal rights before he can exercise his compassion in receiving again a son who has been a rebel, openly injuring and reviling his parent. Though the penitent now comes suing for favor, that other point is first to be carefully considered—nay, it is to be conserved precisely in order that the guilty one may sue with success.

It is here to be noted that the language of the New Testament, when treating of *reconciliation to God*, is by no means to be taken in the sense in which even many orthodox teachers expound it. They make it to be the turning of the sinner from his enmity to God. In repenting, man does indeed change his will Godward. But the doctrine of reconciliation is that God, for a good and sufficient reason—namely, the atonement of Christ,

changes—not His will or His disposition—but His attitude toward the penitent. It is He who is reconciled. This is the doctrine of even that passage (2 Cor. 5 : 20) which, to superficial readers, seems to look most strongly the other way—to exhort simply that men quit their hostility to their Maker. “We pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” Yet just above, in verse 19, we read : “God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.” But how was this done ? “Not imputing their trespasses unto them.” Manifestly the thought here is, that through atoning blood God is not only justified in offering to be at peace with men, but turns toward penitents in the *manifestation* of His eternal love. The sense of the exhortation cited is, then, “Avail yourselves of the provision whereby God can properly show Himself propitious, and see to it that by an appeal to atoning blood He is actually at peace with you.” Thus uniformly in the Christian Scriptures the doctrine of reconciliation is strictly analogous to the reconciliations made under the law “for the sins of the people.” In both God was propitiated. The failure to see this as the constant teaching of the New Testament comes in great part from that view of those ceremonial reconciliations which sinks them to mere shadowy predictions of “good things to come.”\*

Let us continue our inquiries : Was it the fact that the Jewish worshipper before the Altar was received into the divine favor solely and alone on the ground of the blood shed there, and because the life of the victim went for his life ? On this one ground his acceptance was complete, his justification entire, from all the theocratic

---

\* Magee, in his great work, “On Atonement and Sacrifice,” has placed this topic beyond all subsequent controversy. See especially vol. 1, Diss. 20.



consequences of his misdemeanor. The ever-recurring words of absolution ran : " It shall be accepted for him." Then the great analogy we advocate demands that, under the new covenant, repenting sinners must depend for justification and acceptance upon the sacrifice of Calvary, to the exclusion of every other plea. And this is New Testament doctrine. " By Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses " (Acts 13 : 39).

Once more : Was the bloody offering of the Israelite effectual in purifying his person ceremonially from the defilement he had contracted by transgressing ? It was. And because of its virtue in this respect it was commonly called " a cleansing." And this part of " the double cure," as with the other, could in no part be secured in any other way. Here, too, the analogy is complete ; for, contrary to the fruitless labors of many Christians who, aside from Christ, are toiling after a personal holiness, " the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin."

Finally we ask : Were the consequences serious in case of refusal or neglect to expiate even ceremonial defilements and sins of ignorance ? The guilt always remained, and a severe punishment followed—often at once, and in the form of a dreadful Providential visitation. " That soul shall bear his iniquity," was the enforcing clause of the law (Lev. 17 : 16). (See also Deut. 5 : 12 and 27 : 26.) Corresponding to this we should expect the New Testament doctrine to be, that while there is no forgiveness except by the interposition of the blood of Jesus, all neglect of His mediation and all slighting of His blood, by a refusal to trust Him, must end in a far more dreadful death than any visited on the rebellious in the camp of Israel (Heb. 2 : 2, 3 and 10 : 28, 29).

Shall it be said that, even allowing the principle of our analogy to be scriptural, this is carrying it too far? We recognize the fact that there may be applications of it which would be fanciful rather than instructive in gospel truth. But it should be noted that the law of analogy, as our guide in the interpretation of New Testament language, does not bind us, except where the apostles employ words drawn from the phraseology of the Mosaic ritual, or refer to that ritual when defining and explaining the doctrine of the cross. It is therefore a safe rule, *when establishing gospel doctrine*, to introduce no types but those which the New Testament writers cite or directly refer to when dealing with gospel realities. If we are even to go beyond this, it is only when the consistency or completeness of the analogy in the inspired citation clearly demands it. For example, after it is established from apostolic citation that Christ is the sin-atoning Lamb, we are certainly authorized to go farther and insist that, inasmuch as the lamb of the Mosaic sacrifice was necessarily without blemish, so Christ, in being "made sin for us," must necessarily have been—what indeed the New Testament again and again asserts was the fact—absolutely sinless.

The one inquiry is : How are these apostolic words allusive to the Altar to be understood? and how must Jewish hearers of the gospel have understood them? To go beyond this, and search for something in the work of Christ to meet what we read in Moses, is to commit the very fault already condemned—the fault of reading the work of redemption into the alphabet of Leviticus.

But as to the danger of making our analogy too strict, it should be observed that an apostle lays an evangelical stress upon even the spot where the flesh of the burnt-offering was consumed. The body of the victim "was

burned without the camp." "Therefore," saith Paul, "Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13 : 12).

Thus it is that the great central fact of the gospel, in its chief outlines and its intent, is anchored fast by the manner in which the New Testament writers interlink it with the forms and indisputable teachings of the law of Jewish sacrifice. By the spirit of inspiration the true doctrine of the cross is, in this definite manner, stereotyped and placed beyond the reach of honest mistake. Being cast in those ancient moulds of the Mosaic ritual, it must come out before the world in precisely the same shape.

In this way the institution of the Mosaic sacrifices subserves an end as wide as the human race, as enduring as the ages, and as valuable as the truth of everlasting redemption. To settle doctrine so high, to settle it for all time and for all nations, would seem an end every way worthy of God in establishing the Mosaic dispensation. Away back in the transactions of the wilderness and in the services of the tabernacle, the God of Israel prepared to define strictly the true nature and intent of Christ's sufferings and death. Then and there He settled the foundation principles on which the Christian Church must rise and stand. In that early day He began to engrave on the human mind those ideas of a strict atonement which make almost inevitable the true intent of the apostles when they proclaim the death of Jesus "once for all," "that in the dispensation of the fulness of the times," humanitarians and gainsayers notwithstanding, "He might gather together in one all things in Christ."

3. Our theme teaches us how very successful was the divine mission of the ancient Jewish people. The exclamation has been heard from the pulpit, "Judaism was

a failure." And the sentiment is common that the spiritual labor expended upon that people resulted as does the labor of the potter in whose hands the vessel is marred, and who therefore casts the fragments away as a disappointing thing.

But if this were so, it becomes a question how far it unsettles the foundation of the Christian Church. We have seen that in various ways the apostles, in doing their foundation work, proceeded on the basis of what had been accomplished and made ready to their hands among the Jewish people. "Other men had labored, and they had entered into their labors." The Apostle Paul likens that work to the grafting of an olive "wild" by nature into a good olive stock. But if this Jewish stock had proved to be, as some make it, "a failure," and really dead, the grafting of the new branches upon it would have been an absurd nullity.

The notion that the calling and training of Israel was ultimately abortive proceeds on the supposition that the Mosaic institute was truly the gospel symbolically preached to them, and designed for their salvation. This is taken in connection with the fact that true piety was never general in the nation, and from the further fact that when their Messiah came they "stumbled through unbelief," and were "cast away" (Rom. 11 : 7-15).

But notwithstanding their fall for the time being, "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." He had no occasion to be disappointed in Israel. And He was not, because the general conversion of that people in their past generations formed no part of the divine purpose (Deut. 29 : 4 ; Is. 6 : 9, 10 ; Jer. 31 : 31, 32). God looked forward to other and yet future days, and to far more glorious things—namely, the engrafting of the

Gentiles on the Jewish stock, and, through the Gentile Church, the final and far more gracious restoration of "all Israel" (Rom. 11 : 26).

Consistently with this divine plan, and forming a part of it, was the employment of the Jewish people of the apostles' day as a grand agency in the building of the Christian Church. While multitudes of them became, through faith, "living stones" built on the foundation of Christ, the corner-stone, the main body of the nation, refusing to believe, were used as a scaffolding in putting up the walls, and were then cast aside. And for this necessary though temporary use they were exactly fitted by the training of their ritual religion. Though they came short of grace, the great principles were established which had been vitalized among them by the drilling of a thousand years ; and these principles formed the necessary substratum on which the gospel facts were built. Looking in the same direction, though in a different manner and on a far lower plain, were the character and standing of the Gentile peoples immediately around Judea. "*In the wisdom of God* the world by wisdom knew not God." The Greeks left to "seek after wisdom," and the Jews toiling laboriously with their ceremonial round, together with other facts of other nations—all went to bring in "the fulness of the times," to cast up the highway for the coming of the King, and to create that universal expectation which anticipated the gospel and aided in giving it a sure footing among the nations. Judaism a failure ! As well call infancy a failure for the reason that it is of little use to itself, and knows not what it is to become. As well write failure on the work of Creation at the close of the fourth day, because the earth was devoid of all life, whether of man or beast.

## CONCLUSION.

WIDE as is the difference between the preparation of the soil and the sowing of the seed, just so wide is the interpretation now given of Moses' ritual and the understanding commonly had of it. We see in that ancient service a "breaking up of the fallow ground," and little more. But this toilsome and necessary work went before, that the gospel, which alone is the sowing, might not prove a scattering of seed "among the thorns." Because of the previous thorough tillage, our Lord, near the beginning of His ministry, was able to say encouragingly to His disciples, "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor: other men labored, and ye are entered into their labors" (John 4 : 35, 38).











Princeton University Library



32101 064798117

**This Book is Due**

**P.U.L. Form 2**

